Literature or Liturgy?

Edited by
CLEMENS LEONHARD
and HERMUT LÖHR

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
363

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

363



Literature or Liturgy?

Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity

Edited by

Clemens Leonhard and
Hermut Löhr

Mohr Siebeck

Clemens Leonhard, born 1967; studied theology, Near Eastern languages and Jewish studies; 1999 Dr. theol.; 2005 habilitation; since 2006 professor for liturgical studies at the faculty for catholic theology of the University of Münster; since 2008 member of the Cluster of Excellence "Religion and Politics".

Hermut Löhr, born 1963; studied protestant theology and history; 1993 Dr. theol.; 2001 habilitation; 2004–07 professor for New Testament in Jena; since 2007 professor for New Testament, history and literature of early Christianity at the University of Münster; member of the Cluster of Excellence "Religion and Politics".

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-153219-1
ISBN 978-3-16-153218-4
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

In antiquity, Jews, Christians, and other Greeks and Romans took part in gatherings of different kinds and sizes. As members of the Mediterranean cultural world, they would pray, sing, and compose poetry in similar ways. Especially for the early history of Christianity and contemporaneous Judaism, a glaring lack of sources makes it difficult to reconstruct the shape of ritual performances and the hymns and prayers that would have been sung. Yet, the dearth of extant data for each single group can be ameliorated by careful comparison of traces of the ancient rituals among all of them. The present volume collects essays devoted to this broader task of collection, comparison, and reconstruction. When the corpus of relevant texts is enlarged in this way, highly complex and sophisticated material becomes available for reconstructions and the mutual elucidation of the single sources.

The opportunity or even the necessity to engage in comparison raises questions of methodology. The essays in this volume follow different strategies in order to increase the understanding of their sources. In treating different materials and reading different texts, they also promote the discussion of methods and approaches in the field. By way of example, in the past, alleged hymns, songs, poetic texts, and prayers enticed scholars to infer the occasions and places of their performance from their literary forms. Yet, metric texts may have been written for the edification of the individual reader, while purely literary prose compositions that were never intended to be recited in a congregation became liturgical texts even centuries after their epoch of origin. The questions of when a certain passage may be called a "hymn", what makes a poem a liturgical text, and what can be inferred from such a text about well attested or even unknown ritual performances must be answered with great circumspection and care.

Besides its general value for the promotion of understanding texts and discussing important questions pertaining to the field, this volume documents the papers that were given during the symposium "Literature or Liturgy? Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity", held in Münster in December 2009 and organized by the editors. The symposium was generously supported by the Fritz Thyssen Foundation and the University of Münster. Based on the discussions held at this symposium, the authors of the following papers could choose between the presentation of a more general synthesis or survey

over the available material or the analysis of a certain group of texts and scientific questions. The ensuing collection of essays thus invites its readers to cast a bird's eye view on the tradition of classical Hebrew Poetry (Michael Rand) or over the alleged "hymns" of the New Testament, including the section in Philippians (Ralph Brucker), and the questions of what can be known of the performance of hymns and songs in Ancient Christianity (Hermut Löhr and Clemens Leonhard). Similarly, the Psalms of Solomon (Stefan Schreiber) and the Acts of Thomas (Gerard Rouwhorst) are analyzed as important examples for these questions. Also, the large corpus of fragments of scrolls from Qumran that contain prayer texts is analyzed according to their material aspects (Daniel Falk). The volume moreover presents texts of Greek hymns (Didier Pralon) that tend to escape the attention of scholars who are interested in the biblical traditions. Naomi Janowitz' essay uses the Old Testament Suspected Adulteress Ritual of the fifth chapter of the book of Numbers as a point of departure for many observations regarding ritual, prayer, and the use of texts in such contexts. Apart from their achievements in questions of textual details, the papers of this collection widen the scope of scholarship concerned with hymns and prayers in Ancient Judaism and Christianity.

This volume would not have materialized without the help of Martin Lüstraeten's scholarly expertise, language skills, and excellence in all questions of electronic typesetting and the organization of large documents. We also thank Phillip Andrew Davis and Mathias Neumann, whose many comments helped to improve the text of this book considerably. The editors are also most grateful to the publishing house Mohr Siebeck, especially to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki for their patience and their constant support of this project.

January 2014 Clemens Leonhard
University of Münster and Hermut Löhr

Table of Contents

“Songs”, “Hymns”, and “Encomia” in the New Testament?

RALPH BRUCKER

“Literature” or “Liturgy”? Scarcely any other group of texts has received more attention by the central question of our colloquium than the so-called “songs” or “hymns” that have been found in the New Testament writings.[1]

The special interest in these texts is closely connected with the rise of classical *Formgeschichte*. After important preliminary works by scholars like Johannes WEISS, Eduard NORDEN and Josef KROLL,[2] it was not until 1928 that Ernst LOHMEYER became the real “inaugurator” of New Testament hymn research by presenting a study on Phil 2:5–11.[3] LOHMEYER considers Phil 2:6–11 as a pre-Pauline composition and offers a series of enthusiastic epithets in order to describe the genre of the passage: “a kind of traditional early Christian choral”, “a Jewish-Christian psalm”, “a *carmen Christi* in the strict sense”, “a prayer of rejoicing”, and, above all: “a hymn”.[4] LOHMEYER’s conclusions were adapted and continued by the leading masters of classical *Formgeschichte*, namely Rudolf BULTMANN and Martin DIBELIUS, and by their disciples (e.g. Günther BORNKAMM, Ernst KÄSEMANN), in a number of articles and

---

[1] This paper is mainly based on my dissertation that was published in 1997. Hence, more detailed substantiation of my arguments can be found throughout this book (BRUCKER 1997). – The ongoing discussion is reflected most recently in the contributions of the congress volume GERBER/KEITH (ed.), 2009 (particularly OSBORNE 2009, 57–80, and ALETTI 2009, 239–263), and by VOLLENWEIDER 2010, 208–231 (with whom I agree in most aspects).

[2] WEISS 1897; NORDEN 1913; KROLL 1921/22; 1926.

[3] LOHMEYER 1928. The epithet “inaugurator” was labeled upon him by DEICHGRÄBER 1967, 15 (“der eigentliche Inaugurator unseres Forschungszweiges”).

[4] In the German original: “eine Art überlieferten urchristlichen Chorals” (8), “ein judenchristlicher Psalm” (9), “ein carmen Christi in strengem Sinne” (7), “ein jubelndes Gebet” (11), ein “Hymnus” (9).

commentaries.[5] Besides Phil 2:6–11, hymns were discovered in Colossians 1:[12]15–20, 1 Tim 3:16 and John 1:1–18, as well as in 1 Peter (esp. 1 Pet 2:21–25; 3:18–22), Hebrews (esp. Heb 1:3–4) and Ephesians (esp. Eph 1:3–14; 2:14–18; 5:14). Closer attention was also paid to passages that are explicitly introduced as songs in their literary context, like the *cantica* in Luke's infancy narrative (Luke 1:46–55; 1:68–79; 2:14; 2:29–32) and the odes in the Revelation of John (Rev 5:9–10; 15:3–4 etc.). The reconstruction of "Christ hymns" and other formulaic pieces considered to originate from early Christian liturgy seemed to allow a deeper insight into the worship of the first Christians. These optimistic attempts found their climax in the thesis that 1 Peter as a whole (except for the epistolary frame) contained a complete baptismal service held at Rome, including all the songs and even the sermon![6]

From the middle of the 1960s to the early 1970s, several monographs summed up the discussion on the early Christian hymns that had meanwhile been discovered, so that a certain scholarly consensus was reached.[7] Ever since, early Christian "hymns" or "songs" have been an integral part of introductions and handbooks to the New Testament. In the recent critical editions of the New Testament by Nestle/Aland (NA^{26} and NA^{27}), most of these passages have been arranged colometrically, suggesting (at least to modern readers) some kind of "poetic" character.[8]

At the same time, skepticism concerning the methodological approach increased.[9] What are the criteria for identifying a certain passage as a

---

[5] See bibliography. – It is noteworthy that DIBELIUS is much more cautious to identify New Testament passages as "hymns" than other authors (cf. especially his *Forschungsbericht*, DIBELIUS 1931, 207–242).

[6] Thus PREISKER in WINDISCH/PREISKER 1951, 156–162. This is even exceeded by CROSS 1954 (arguing for an Easter baptismal service).

[7] SCHILLE 1965; DEICHGRÄBER 1967; WENGST 1972; cf. also SANDERS 1971. A very influential monograph on one single "hymn" (Phil 2:5–11) is MARTIN 1967 (2nd ed. 1983, 3rd ed. 1997; each edition with an updated preface).

[8] The suggestive power of this editorial device is often neglected. This point is especially stressed by PEPPARD 2008, 319–342. – Note that the recent UBS Greek New Testament, Fourth Revised Edition (2nd print 1994), does not present as many texts colometrically as Nestle/Aland's Novum Testamentum Graece does (e.g. Phil 2:6–11 and Col 1:15–20 are not set in lines), although both editions are based on the same Greek text.

[9] For early skepticism see e.g. DELLING 1969, 503–505; RESE 1970, 75–95; RIESENFELD 1983, 155–168; FRANKOWSKI 1983, 183–194; SCHENK 1983, 144–146; SCHENK 1984, 193–195; BALCHIN 1985, 65–94 (the latter – a thorough article – unfortunately escaped my attention when I was preparing my book).

"song", i.e. a piece of poetry, cited by a New Testament author? The main features that are claimed are exuberant style, a certain rhythm, and especially parallelism (in Old Testament scholarship this is known as "parallelismus membrorum"). In addition (inspired by Eduard NORDEN, but somewhat simplified), relative clauses (i.e. the presence of the relative pronoun ὅς) and participles are taken as important characteristics.[10] Looking more closely at these alleged criteria for distinguishing poetry from prose, they prove themselves to be rather weak and eventually based on mere feeling, since all of them are to be found in prose as well. A second objection concerns the presupposition that the New Testament authors did not quote their "songs" or "hymns" without any alteration but rather adapted them to their own theology (e.g. the reference to the cross in Phil 2:8 – θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ – is considered to be a Pauline "addition" by many scholars since LOHMEYER). If this is accepted, the task of modern research is to "reconstruct" the "original" form of the hymn. By this approach, an enormously creative potential was set free, but unfortunately it only rarely produced generally accepted results. As for a third objection, the rediscovery of ancient rhetoric opened up new perspectives: So, e.g., the solemn character of Heb 1:1–4 does not necessarily imply a liturgical background but might simply reflect the rhetorical conventions of opening a text with an *exordium*.[11] Klaus BERGER, whose "New *Formgeschichte*" is based on ancient rhetorical categories, suggested in regard to the passages that have often been called "hymns", instead using the term "encomium", the ancient generic name for a "speech of praise".[12] Following his suggestion, as several scholars do, means dismissing the question of the "poetic" character of these passages. It does not mean, however, dismissing the question of whether they are quotations. And, last but not least, the question of the "hymnic" character is not at all solved, since according to ancient rhetorical theory an "encomium" to a divine being can very well be called a (prose) "hymn".[13]

---

[10] The most complete list of criteria is compiled by GLOER 1984, 115–132. GLOER is well aware that many of the criteria are rather uncertain; nevertheless, his list of alleged "early Christian hymns" (131f.) is remarkably long.

[11] The seminal analysis of Heb 1:1–4 is GRÄSSER 1971, 55–91, and is adopted in almost all recent commentaries on Hebrews.

[12] BERGER 1984a, 1173–1195; BERGER 1984b, 344–346, cf. 239–247 (recent edition: BERGER 2005, 401–403, cf. 297–305).

[13] Also the proposal made by HENGEL 1987, 357–404, to speak of "psalms" rather than "hymns", is not at all helpful: In Old Testament scholarship, those psalms that praise God are called "hymns" as well, and most of the alleged "hymns" in the New

In order to establish an appropriate methodological base, a thorough knowledge of ancient literary theory and practice seems to be required. What criteria for distinguishing poetry from prose apply to Greek (and Latin) texts in Hellenistic and Roman times? How can different kinds of texts that contain praise be defined? Are there analogies for the phenomenon observed in the New Testament that an argumentative context suddenly shifts into an exuberant praise of Christ or of God?

My own research of Greek and Latin literature from the Homeric Hymns up to the mid-second century CE[14] has reached the following results:

There is a very clear distinction between poetry and prose: Poetry follows a meter, i.e. a certain regular pattern of long and short syllables. If there is no such pattern, we are dealing with prose. As for "parallelism", this is no evidence for poetry, but a well-known and often reflected rhetorical device (ancient terms are *isocolon* and *antithesis*).

The genres of praise in poetry can be subdivided in two categories: a song praising a god is called a "hymn", a song praising a human being is called an "encomium".[15]

Hymns usually have a three-part structure: the invocation of the deity, the epic (and often argumentative) central part and the final petition (*invocatio, pars epica, precatio*).[16] When the last part predominates, the hymn as a whole may be seen as a prayer (here the boundaries are fluid). With regard to their style, hymns show a great exuberance, typically using superlatives and words like "all", "many", "always" etc. As for the *Sitz im*

Testament do not really bear resemblance to the Old Testament Psalms (if any, then the Lucan *cantica* and the "odes" of Revelation, on which see note 33 below).

[14] BRUCKER 1997. – A helpful starting point as a collection of relevant data was (apart from BERGER 1984a, THRAEDE 1994, and the "classical" older works like NORDEN 1913; WÜNSCH 1914; KEYSSNER 1932) especially LATTKE 1991. – Works that escaped my attention but are to be recommended include PERNOT 1993 and KRENTZ 1995. – Recent publications containing sources and information are the impressive hymn collection FURLEY/BREMER 2001 and the congress volume LEHMANN (ed.) 2007; cf. especially on the Greek philosophical hymns ZUNTZ 2005.

[15] This subdivision goes back to Plato, Republic 10, 607a (cf. Laws 7, 801e.822bc) and is predominant in ancient (Hellenistic) lyric theory.

[16] The three-part structure was first described by AUSFELD 1903, 503–547, who introduced the terms *invocatio, pars epica, precatio* cited above. BREMER 1981, 196, criticizes the term *pars epica* because of the argumentative character of the middle part. He proposes the term "argumentation" instead, of which he distinguishes four forms. Cf. also FURLEY/BREMER 2001, 50–63, esp. 51, where the three parts are called "invocation, praise, prayer".

Leben, there is a variety of possible applications of the genre. Besides cultic contexts, hymns can be found in political life and in philosophical writings as well, and even for sophisticated entertainment.[17]

The “encomium” as a song praising a human being resembles the hymn in its stylistic exuberance but it is more free in structure.

In rhetorical theory, praise belongs (like its counterpart, blame) to the γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν, being the third genre of speech after the γένος δικανικόν (judicial/forensic speech) and the γένος συμβουλευτικόν (deliberative/political speech).[18] A speech of praise is usually called an “encomium” (ἐγκώμιον); some authors (beginning with Aristotle) make a distinction between the longer “encomium” as a speech mainly dealing with actions, and the shorter “epainos” (ἔπαινος = “praise”) which illustrate the greatness of virtue. In addition to the normal case of a human object of praise, there are various other objects such as places or virtues (even – not always too serious – humble objects like bumble bees or salt), which are reflected in rhetorical theory rather late (first century CE) despite their long tradition in practice. This is true for gods as well. Terminology and prescriptions for the rhetorical “hymn” (ὕμνος) are not found in the rhetorical handbooks until the late first century CE. Stylistically, the encomia are characterized by augmentation and embellishment, making rich use of rhetorical figures. This converges largely with what is defined in ancient stylistic theory as “sublime” or “elevated” style. According to the principle that the style of a text should be “appropriate” to its content, ancient theorists even recommend the change of rhetorical genre and style within a speech when the subject-matter requires it. Epideictic elements in particular (i.e. praise and blame) therefore have their place in judicial and deliberative speeches, and the sublime is to be treated in a sublime style.

The theoretical precepts can be confirmed in practice. Already in poetry, hymnic passages quite often occur within larger works (epic, drama, didactic epos) as a prooemium or as a climax or as a highlight in between.[19] In prose, epideictic passages in elevated style can be found in

[17] Well-known examples are the Athenian Hymn to Demetrius Poliorcetes (political); Aristotle’s Hymn to Arete/Virtue as well as Cleanthes’ Hymn to Zeus (philosophical); and the hymns of Callimachus (entertainment).

[18] The Latin terms are *genus iudiciale*, *genus deliberativum* and *genus demonstrativum*.

[19] The most famous examples are the hymn to Zeus at the beginning of Aratus, Phaenoma (v. 1–18), and the hymn to Venus at the beginning of Lucretius, De rerum natura (1.1–49).

all sorts of literary genres, such as religious-philosophical writings[20], scientific treatises[21], erotic adventure novels[22] and (of special interest for the New Testament) letters[23]. Here, too, there is a great variety of possibilities: Elevated or even hymnic passages can be found at the beginning, at the finale or at the center of a text, as well as at any point of an argument, forming an excursus. However, all of these are firmly anchored within the larger context. Beside exuberant praise, its counterpart in the epideictic genre, blame or polemic, is also found regularly, even both – praise and blame – within the same text. A skilled orator like Cicero can even use the form of a hymn in a parodistic way for a solemn rebuke and put it into the mouth of the personified *patria* (as he does in his First Speech against Catiline, § 18).

These insights concerning shift of style and genre in ancient texts should advise us to be cautious about isolating New Testament passages in elevated style too quickly from their context, insinuating their former literary independence. Rather, we should examine in the first place how the passage is embedded in the present context and, above all, whether the actual text itself signals a quotation.

For a "proof of concept", the task was to analyze a whole New Testament writing with regard to shifts of style and genre. The ideal test case for this was Paul's Letter to the Philippians, because it contained not only two alleged "hymns" (Phil 2:6–11, 3:20–21) but also further elements of praise (e.g. the praise of Paul's co-workers Timothy and Epaphroditus, Phil 2:19–30), plus some shifts of style that have caused many scholars to advocate complicated partition theories for the letter (e.g. the shift to a harsh invective of Paul's opponents, Phil 3:1–2).

The analysis of Philippians has shown that the letter is a literary unity (not a compilation) and that it is carefully constructed, following the conventions of ancient rhetoric. The rhetorical structure can be outlined as follows:

---

[20] E.g. Cicero's hymn to Philosophy, Tusculanae disputationes 5.5f.; Philo's encomium on Augustus, Legatio ad Gaium 143–151, as well as Philo's encomium to Moses, De vita Mosis, 1.148–162.

[21] E.g. Cleomedes, Caelestia 2.1, containing a praise of the Sun as well as a vituperation against Epicurus.

[22] Especially Apuleius, Metamorphoses ("The Golden Ass"), book 11.

[23] Apart from pure epideictic letters, "elements of praise or blame are components of nearly every type of letter" (STOWERS 1986, 80; cf. 77–90). This can be observed particularly in philosophical letters, e.g. those of Seneca, Apollonius of Tyana or the pseudepigraphical Pythagorean letters.

1:1–2	Epistolary prescript
1:3–11	*prooemium/exordium*
1:12–26	*Narratio*
1:27–30	*Propositio*
2:1–3:21	*Probatio*
2:1–11	*probatio, part I*
2:12–18	*probatio, part II*
2:19–30	*digressio/excursus*
3:1–21	*probatio, part III*[24]
4:1–20	*conclusio/peroratio*
4:21–23	Epistolary postscript

The basic rhetorical genre of the letter is deliberative, but it contains a number of epideictic elements. I will only give two prominent examples:

(1) Phil 2:6–11 has turned out to be a “praise of Christ” written by Paul himself and firmly interwoven with its immediate context (2:1–11) as well as with the letter as a whole. Appropriate to the subject-matter, it is written in an elevated, one can even say “hymnic” style. But the passage is neither poetic (because of the lack of meter) nor is it a hymn (because of the lack of the typical three-part structure).[25] From a rhetorical point of view it could be called an “encomium”. However, an encomium normally recounts at length the virtues of a person and the praiseworthy actions resulting from these. As this is not quite the case with our passage, I prefer the term “epainos” (ἔπαινος) which is used alternatively by a number of ancient theorists.

(2) Phil 3:2 is not a literary break indicating an interpolation but a well-calculated contrast, using strong rhetorical devices (anaphora,

---

[24] In the third part of the *probatio*, Phil 3:1–21, one can find a rhetorical structure of its own: 3:1 forms a *transitus* (caused by the preceding *digressio*), followed by a *prooemium/exordium* (3:2–4a), a *narratio* (3:4b–7), a *propositio* (3:8–11), a *probatio* (3:12–14), a *refutatio* (3:15–16), and a *conclusio/peroratio* (3:17–21). However, this observation of a rhetorical sub-structure is not to be considered as evidence supporting a partition hypothesis (*pace* the critique of AUNE 2003, 358). Rather, the rhetorical pattern quite often occurs in sub-divisions of ancient texts and is recommended in rhetorical theory as well; for details see BRUCKER 1997, 297f. with notes 33 and 34.

[25] Cf. also FEE 1992, 29–46, where the passage is defined as “Exalted Pauline Prose” (title); this very clear article had escaped my attention until I prepared my text for publication. Meanwhile, FEE’S commentary (see FEE 1995, 39–46.191–229) appeared. COLLINS 2002, 361–372, explicitly refers to FEE 1992 and BRUCKER 1997 and subscribes to this opinion. Cf. further BASEVI/CHAPA 1993, 338–356, and recently the commentary by ALETTI (ALETTI 2005, 140–147).

alliteration, asyndeton) in order to attract the attention of the readers. The threefold invective of the opponents is preceded by a praise of Paul's co-workers Timothy and Epaphroditus (2:19–30). The same contrast governs the succession from 3:2 to 3:3 (emphatic antithetic "we", also followed by a threefold description) and returns again in 3:17–21. Rhetorically, the sharp juxtaposition of praise and blame serves for polarization. This is not without analogies in the ancient texts which I studied for comparison.

The insights gained from Paul's Letter to the Philippians have consequences for the understanding of other New Testament passages that have been called "hymns". Let me briefly delineate this point.

Phil 1:3–11 forms the *prooemium/exordium*. According to the conventions of rhetoric, it contains several epideictic elements (especially praise of the addressees and praise of God) and shows a solemn style (note especially the frequency of πᾶς and its derivatives). Analogies within the New Testament are of course the *prooemia* of the remaining letters, some of which have indeed been determined as "hymns" some time ago (Heb 1:1–4; Eph 1:3–14; 2 Cor 1:3–11; 1 Pet 1:3–12 – the latter three are nowadays seen as "introductory eulogies"[26]). Also the prologue of John (John 1:1–18) falls under this category, being an integral part of the gospel as a solemn opening ("overture").

Phil 2:6–11 is, as stated above, a "praise of Christ" within the letter, but is neither a hymn nor pre-Pauline. Since this text is often introduced as the principal witness for "hymns" in the New Testament, the result of my investigation raises reasonable doubt concerning the other comparable passages. Of the many alleged "hymns" that have been detected in the past decades, the two that presently enjoy the greatest consensus among scholars are Colossians 1:15–20 and 1 Tim 3:16. In my opinion, Colossians 1:15–20 is an epideictic passage firmly anchored within its context. It is a "praise of Christ" inspired by Old Testament and Hellenistic Jewish texts praising Wisdom. The relative pronoun ὅς is a sign of contextual integration rather than indicating a quotation[27], the more so as relative clauses begin as early as 1:13 and the whole sentence begins at 1:9

---

[26] Following DAHL 1951, 241–264, who coined the term "Briefeingangseulogie" .

[27] This can be learned from any Greek grammar. Against several researchers who favor the reconstruction of hymns on the basis of New Testament texts, it must be stated that no ancient hymn (nor any other independent text) *begins* with a relative pronoun.

(for a similarly long sentence structure cf. Eph 1:3–14).[28] In 1 Tim 3:16, on the other hand, the striking break in the grammatical construction (the masculine relative pronoun ὅς refers back to the neuter μυστήριον which is not congruent)[29] suggests that here we indeed have a quotation. However, the six short sentences in the passive voice do not follow the typical features of a hymn. The key word ὁμολογουμένως in the introduction gives the decisive hint. Most likely, we are dealing with a confession of faith that was designed to be spoken rhythmically (cf. 1 Tim 6:12: ὡμολόγησας τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν "[you have] confessed the good confession"). The original beginning may have been "We believe in Christ Jesus, who…".

Phil 3:20–21 has – due to its ceremonial style – also been considered as a pre-Pauline hymn.[30] This is, in my opinion, as unfounded as it is in the case of Phil 2:6–11. But both passages can be found at the end of an argument. Thus they form a solemn climax. This has striking analogies in Paul's letter to the Romans. In a similar way, Rom 8:31–39 and 11:33–36 function as climaxes to chapters 1–8 and chapters 9–11, respectively. Further comparable passages within the New Testament are Eph 3:14–21 and 1 Pet 2:9–10.

Phil 2:19–30 is best seen as a digression (*digressio*/*excursus*) from the line of argumentation. On the occasion of giving some information about his travel plans, Paul intones a high commendation of his co-workers Timothy and Epaphroditus. The nearest parallel to this is Paul's famous praise of love in 1 Cor 13, which also forms an epideictic excursus within

---

[28] *Pace* GORDLEY 2007, 2, who, despite following a rhetorical approach and demonstrating the function of the passage within the context of the epistle, still sees it as "a citation of a pre-existing prose-hymn". For the opposite view see BALCHIN 1985, 65–94 (disregarded by GORDLEY), and recently PIZZUTO 2006. VOLLENWEIDER 2010, 225–227, proposes the descriptive term "hymnisches Christuslob" ("hymnic praise of Christ") and deems the thesis of an older traditional piece unnecessary.

[29] It should be mentioned that the majority of the manuscripts read θεός "God" instead of ὅς "who" and that this reading is adopted in the *textus receptus* and therefore found in the older translations (including Luther and the King James Version). But ὅς is clearly the *lectio difficilior* that called for a scribal "correction", and so some manuscripts even have the relative pronoun ὅ (neuter). The reading θεός becomes evident from the scribal custom of abbreviating the *nomina sacra*. Thus, it is just a small step from the uncials OC to ΘC and to complete this by a horizontal line as an abbreviation mark. See METZGER 1994, 573–574.

[30] Cf. the *Forschungsbericht* and discussion by REUMANN 1984, 593–609 (with "a somewhat tentative vote for a hymn" 604). In his commentary, Reumann is even more cautious, cf. REUMANN 2008, ad loc. See recently also SCHINKEL 2006, 68–122 (esp. 100–102), who votes for a Pauline text passage.

the context of 1 Cor 12–14 and which – despite its “hymnic” style – is generally considered as a genuinely Pauline prose text.[31]

Another element of praise in the letter to the Philippians is Paul’s self-praise (*periautologia*) in Phil 3:4b–7, which is full of irony. A parallel can be found in Paul’s “Fool’s Speech” in 2 Cor 11:16–12:10 (cf. already 10:12–18). These incidents show Paul’s critical distance from epideictic rhetoric.[32]

To round out the picture, let me add a short remark on those New Testament passages apart from the letters that are explicitly introduced as songs. Even the *cantica* in Luke’s infancy narrative, as well as the odes in the Revelation of John are not liturgical but literary texts. They all imitate the rhythmic prose that the Septuagint used in the translation of the Psalms and psalm-like passages, without containing clearly identifiable quotations.[33]

According to the ancient definition of “poetry” as metrical, there are, in fact, only three poetic quotations in the New Testament: Acts 17:28, 1 Cor 15:33, and Titus 1:12.[34] The first one is indeed a quotation from a hymn – namely the hymn to Zeus in Aratus, Phaenomena, v. 5.[35] The Lucan Paul uses it in his Athenian speech as an argument against idolatry, thus citing an authority that is recognized by the audience (for this rhetorical device cf. already Acts 17:23). The other two quotations from Greek poets (probably Menander and Epimenides, respectively) are proverbs used as illustrations for paraenesis.[36]

In summary, it can be stated that the solemn passages praising Christ or God in the New Testament writings are not quotations of “songs” or “hymns” (and hence traces of early Christian liturgy), but rather examples of a literary phenomenon that has numerous analogies in other ancient texts. Even the rhetorical term “encomium”, nowadays preferred by many scholars, should be used with some hesitation, because it suggests literary

---

[31] See most recently FOCANT 2009, 99–118 (with further literature).

[32] See FORBES 1986, 1–30; BIANCHINI 2006.

[33] With regard to Revelation, this has been shown by DELLING 1959, 107–137; DEICHGRÄBER 1967, 44–59, and at length JÖRNS 1971. This view is widely accepted in recent scholarship. The *cantica* in Luke’s infancy narrative are still hotly debated, but there seems to be a tendency today to look more at their function in their actual context than at their hypothetical “origin”; see most recently OSBORNE 2009, 281–294; SIFFER 2009, 295–308; GERBER 2009, 83–98.

[34] Cf. BRUCKER 2003, 1420; BRUCKER 2011, 185.

[35] Cf. above, note 19.

[36] On all three quotations see RENEHAN 1973, 17–46.

autonomy and elaborateness. In my opinion, the most appropriate term to describe the phenomenon is "epideictic passages" because it indicates the contextual connection of the texts in question.

Bibliography

ALETTI, J-N.: Les passages néotestamentaires en prose rythmée. Propositions sur leurs fonctions multiples. In: GERBER/KEITH (ed.) 2009, 239–263.

– Saint Paul, Epître aux Philippiens. Introduction, traduction et commentaire (EtB.NS 55), Paris 2005.

AUNE, D. E.: The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric, Louisville 2003.

AUSFELD, K.: De Graecorum precationibus quaestiones. In: Jahrbücher für classische Philologie. Supplementband 28 (1903), 503–547.

BALCHIN, J. F.: Colossians 1:15–20: An Early Christian Hymn? The Argument from Style. In: Vox Evangelica 15 (1985), 65–94.

BASEVI, C./CHAPA, J.: The Rhetorical Function of a Pauline 'Hymn'. In: Rhetoric and the New Testament. Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference (JSNT.S 90), ed. S. E. PORTER and T. H. OLBRICHT, Sheffield 1993, 338–356.

BERGER, K.: Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament. In: ANRW II.25.2 (1984), 1031–1432.1831–1885 [= BERGER 1984a].

– Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments, Heidelberg 1984 [= BERGER 1984b].

– Formen und Gattungen im Neuen Testament (UTB 2532), Tübingen/Basel 2005.

BIANCHINI, F.: L'elogio di sé in Cristo. L'utilizzo della "periautologia" nel contesto dei Filippesi 3,1–4,1 (AnBib 164), Rome 2006.

BORNKAMM, G.: Der Lobpreis Gottes. Röm 11,33–36 [1951]. In: id.: Das Ende des Gesetzes, Paulusstudien (Gesammelte Aufsätze I = BEvTh 16), München 1952, 70–75.

– Art. Formen und Gattungen II. Im NT. In: RGG³ 2 (1958), 999–1005.

– Zum Verständnis des Christushymnus Phil 2,6–11. In: id.: Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum (Gesammelte Aufsätze II = BEvTh 28), München 1959, 177–187.

BREMER, J. M.: Greek Hymns. In: Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World (SGRR 2), ed. H. S. VERSNEL, Leiden 1981, 193–215.

BRUCKER, R.: 'Christushymnen' oder 'epideiktische Passagen'? Studien zum Stilwechsel im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt (FRLANT 176), Göttingen 1997.

– Art. Poesie, I. 3. Neues Testament. In: RGG⁴ 6 (2003), 1420.

– Art. Poetry, I. 3. New Testament. In: RPP 10 (2011), 185.

BULTMANN, R.: Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannesevangelium. In: ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, FS Hermann Gunkel, ed. H. SCHMIDT, vol. II (FRLANT 36/2), Göttingen 1923, 3–26.

– Das Evangelium des Johannes (KEK ¹⁰II), Göttingen 1941.

– Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief [1947]. In: id.: Exegetica, Tübingen 1967, 285–297.

COLLINS, A. Y.: Psalms, Philippians 2:6–11, and the Origins of Christology. In: Bibl. Interpr. 11 (2003), 361–372.

CROSS, F. L.: I Peter. A Paschal Liturgy, London 1954.

DAHL, N. A.: Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes. In: ThZ 7 (1951), 241–264.

DEICHGRÄBER, R.: Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit (StUNT 5), Göttingen 1967.
DELLING, G.: Zum gottesdienstlichen Stil der Johannesapokalypse. In: NT 3 (1959), 107–137 (reprinted in: id.: Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum, Göttingen 1970, 425–450).
– Art. ὕμνος κτλ. In: ThWNT VIII (1969), 492–506 (ET: TDNT 8, 1972, 489–503).
DIBELIUS, M.: An die Thessalonicher I.II. An die Philipper (HNT 11), Tübingen [3]1937.
– An die Kolosser, Epheser. An Philemon (HNT 12), Tübingen [2]1927.
– Die Pastoralbriefe (HNT 13), Tübingen [2]1931.
– Zur Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments (außerhalb der Evangelien). In: ThR.NF 3 (1931), 207–242.
FEE, G. D.: Philippians 2:5–11: Hymn or Exalted Pauline Prose? In: BBR 2 (1992), 29–46.
– Paul's Letter to the Philippians (NIC), Grand Rapids 1995.
FOCANT, C.: De l'art de digresser pour donner au sujet une profondeur radicale (1 Co 13). In: GERBER/KEITH (ed.) 2009, 99–118.
FORBES, C.: Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony. Paul's Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric. In: NTS 32 (1986), 1–30.
FRANKOWSKI, J.: Early Christian Hymns Recorded in the New Testament. A reconsideration of the question in the light of Heb 1,3. In: BZ 27 (1983), 183–194.
FURLEY, W. D./BREMER, J. M.: Greek Hymns. Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period, 2 vols (STAC 9–10), Tübingen 2001.
GERBER, D.: "Ton salut que tu as prépare". Les diverses fonctions du cantique de Syméon en Luc-Actes. In: GERBER/KEITH (ed.) 2009, 83–98.
– and KEITH, P. (ed.): Les hymnes du Nouveau Testament et leurs fonctions (XXII congrès de l'Association Catholique Française pour l'Étude de la Bible, Strasbourg, 2007), Paris 2009.
GLOER, W. H.: Homologies and Hymns in the New Testament. Form, Content, and Criteria for Identification. In: Perspectives in religious studies 11 (1984), 115–132.
GRÄSSER, E.: Hebr 1,1–4. Ein exegetischer Versuch. In: EKK Vorarbeiten 3, Zürich/Neukirchen 1971, 55–91.
HENGEL, M.: Das Christuslied im frühesten Gottesdienst. In: Weisheit Gottes – Weisheit der Welt, FS J. Ratzinger, St. Ottilien 1987, vol. 1, 357–404 (reprinted in: id.: Studien zur Christologie. Kleine Schriften IV, WUNT 201, Tübingen 2006, 205–258).
JÖRNS, K.-P.: Das hymnische Evangelium. Untersuchungen zu Aufbau, Funktion und Herkunft der hymnischen Stücke in der Johannesoffenbarung (StNT 5), Gütersloh 1971.
KÄSEMANN, E.: Eine urchristliche Taufliturgie [1949]. In: id.: Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen I, Göttingen 1960, 34–51.
– Kritische Analyse von Phil 2,5–11 [1950]. In: id.: Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen I, Göttingen 1960, 51–95.
– Aufbau und Anliegen des johanneischen Prologs [1957]. In: id.: Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen II, Göttingen 1964, 155–180.
– Art. Formeln II. Liturgische Formeln im NT. In: RGG[3] 2 (1958), 993–996.
KEYSSNER, K.: Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus (WSAW 2), Stuttgart 1932.
KRENTZ, E.: Epideiktik and Hymnody: The New Testament and Its World. In: BR 40 (1995), 50–97.
KROLL, J.: Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandreia (Libelli 240), Darmstadt [2]1968 (reprint of the first edition 1921/22) [= KROLL, 1921/22].

– Die Hymnendichtung des frühen Christentums. In: Antike 2 (1926), 258–281.
LATTKE, M.: Hymnus. Materialien zu einer Geschichte der antiken Hymnologie (NTOA 19), Freiburg (Schweiz)/Göttingen 1991.
LEHMANN, Y. (ed.): L’hymne antique et son public (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 7), Turnhout 2007.
LOHMEYER, E.: Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5–11 (SHAW.PH 1927/28, 4), Heidelberg 1928 (= [2]1961).
MARTIN, R. P.: Carmen Christi. Philippians ii.5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship, Cambridge 1967, 2[nd] ed. Grand Rapids 1983, 3[rd] ed. Downers Grove 1997 (under the slightly modified title “A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship”).
METZGER, B. M.: A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. Second edition, Stuttgart and New York 1994.
NORDEN, E.: Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede, Leipzig/Berlin 1913 (= [7]1996).
OSBORNE, T. P.: “Récitez entre vous des psaumes, des hymnes et des cantiques inspires” (Ep 5,19). Un état de la question sur l’étude des “hymnes” du Nouveau Testament. In: GERBER/KEITH (ed.) 2009, 57–80.
– Les “hymnes” du récit de l’enfance de l’évangile de Luc. Première partie: cinq thèses sur la fonction des hymnes de Lc 1–2. In: GERBER/KEITH (ed.) 2009, 281–294.
PEPPARD, M.: “Poetry”, “Hymns” and “Traditional Material” in New Testament Epistles or How to Do Things with Indentations. In: JSNT 30 (2008), 319–342.
PERNOT, L.: La rhétorique de l’éloge dans le monde gréco-romain (Collection des études Augustiniennes, Série “Antiquité” 137/138), 2 vols., Paris 1993.
PIZZUTO, V. A.: A Cosmic Leap of Faith. An Authorial, Structural, and Theological Investigation of the Cosmic Christology in Col 1:15–20 (CBET 41), Leuven 2006.
RENEHAN, R.: Classical Greek Quotations in the New Testament. In: The Heritage of the Early Church. Essays in Honor of the very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky, ed. D. NEIMAN and M. SCHATKIN (OCA 195), Rome 1973, 17–46.
RESE, M.: Formeln und Lieder im Neuen Testament. Einige notwendige Anmerkungen. In: VF 15 (1970), 75–95.
REUMANN, J.: Philippians 3.20–21 – a Hymnic Fragment? In NTS 30 (1984), 593–609.
– Philippians (The Anchor Yale Bible 33B), New Haven and London 2008.
RIESENFELD, H.: Unpoetische Hymnen im Neuen Testament? Zu Phil 2,1–11. In: Glaube und Gerechtigkeit. In Memoriam Rafael Gyllenberg (SESJ 38), ed. J. KIILUNEN et al., Helsinki 1983, 155–168.
SANDERS, J. T.: The New Testament Christological Hymns. Their Historical Religious Background (MSSNTS 15), Cambridge 1971.
SCHENK, W.: Christus, das Geheimnis der Welt als dogmatisches und ethisches Grundprinzip des Kolosserbriefes. In: EvTh 43 (1983), 138–155.
– Die Philipperbriefe des Paulus. Kommentar. Stuttgart 1984.
– Art. Poesie, biblische, II. Neues Testament. In: TRE 26 (1996), 748–752.
SCHILLE, G.: Frühchristliche Hymnen, Berlin 1965.
SCHINKEL, D.: Die himmlische Bürgerschaft. Untersuchungen zu einem urchristlichen Sprachmotiv im Spannungsfeld von religiöser Integration und Abgrenzung im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert (FRLANT 220), Göttingen 2006.
SIFFER, N.: Les “hymnes” du récit de l’enfance de l’évangile de Luc. Seconde partie: les hymnes de Lc 1–2 et l’accomplissement du dessein salvifique de Dieu. In: GERBER/KEITH (ed.), 2009, 295–308.

STOWERS, S. K.: Letter-Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity (Library of Early Christianity 5), Philadelphia 1986.
VOLLENWEIDER, S.: Hymnus, Enkomion oder Psalm? Schattengefechte in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. In: NTS 56 (2010), 208–231.
WEISS, J.: Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik. In: Theologische Studien, FS Bernhard Weiss, Göttingen 1897, 165–247.
WENGST, K.: Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums (StNT 7), Gütersloh 1972.
WINDISCH, H./PREISKER, H.: Die katholischen Briefe (HNT 15), Tübingen [3]1951.
WÜNSCH, R.: Art. Hymnos. In: PRE IX/1 (1914), 140–183.
ZUNTZ, G.: Griechische philosophische Hymnen. Aus dem Nachlaß hg. v. H. CANCIK u. L. KÄPPEL (STAC 35), Tübingen 2005.

Water, Word, and Name: The Shifting Pragmatics of the Sotah/Suspected Adulteress Ritual

NAOMI JANOWITZ

Liturgy is a special kind of conversation, words sometimes addressed to the gods and sometimes about them. These conversations are part of complex performances that combine words with the use of all sorts of objects. While, as we will discuss below, some ritual acts do not include the use of any words at all, this paper examines the Sotah/Suspected Adulteress Rite where liturgy is of central importance. Liturgy is a compelling example of the multi-functionality of language because words are spoken to bring about concrete results. That is, participating in liturgy is a direct mode of social action (blessing, marrying, etc.). These modes of action overlap with but are distinct from that of other types of texts (novels) because of the many different ways what-is-said maps onto what-is-done (SILVERSTEIN 1997). Liturgical formulas are highly context-creating, for example, invoking the presence of a deity or transforming a place from profane to sacred. Because it so obviously attributes power to words, liturgy is a vivid example of "the central place it [language] occupies in the social construction of reality" (BAUMANN/BRIGGS 1990, 60). Certainly we could analyze liturgy from many angles, seeking, for example, an historical kernel in vivid imagery[1] or a presumed theological adversary encoded in the terminology.[2] But we cannot avoid asking the central question: What is a particular liturgical composition trying to bring about and how does it achieve the goal?

Scholars of religion, recognizing that liturgical formulas are not primarily referential (propositional), readily adopted AUSTIN's theory of perfor-

---

[1] Cf. for example the case made by Philip ALEXANDER that the imagery of the celestial court in hekhalot texts is closest to that of the court at the time of Diocletian, cf. ALEXANDER 1991, 288.

[2] LEICHT argues that some of the phrases in The Prayer of Jacob are "anti-gnostic" polemics, cf. LEICHT 1999, 162–163.

matives (AUSTIN 1962).[3] "Performativity" seemed to characterize more precisely the role of linguistic forms that in previous scholarship might have been called the "magical" aspects of words or even "magic" per se. The full scope of the multi-functionality of language, however, can be explained fully by neither AUSTIN's focus on first-person verbs nor TAMBIAH's general description of the "magical" power of words.[4] The theory of performativity characterized in this way, Richard BAUMANN and Charles BRIGGS explain, "has rested on a 'literal force hypothesis' that posits a one-to-one correlation between performative utterances and illocutionary forces, even if most theorists admit that surface forms frequently do not directly signal illocutionary force" (BAUMANN/BRIGGS 1990, 62). The same is true of all the speech acts theories that derive from AUSTIN's work including SEARLE's (SEARLE 1969); the theories are themselves evidence of the partially opaque nature of how words "do things." As Michelle ROSALDO explained, Searle's analysis is "an ethnography – however partial – of contemporary views of human personhood and action as these are linked to culturally particular modes of speaking" (ROSALDO 1982, 228).[5] Numerous other linguistic forms can encode Austin's "illocutionary" force, even turn-taking (BAUMANN/BRIGGS 1990, 62). We can only find out how effective speech and acts are conceptualized and enacted by casting a net both much broader and finer than AUSTIN envisioned. Therefore the present study places AUSTIN's "performativity" in the broader semiotic conceptions of the multi-functionality of signs forged by JAKOBSON (JAKOBSON 1960), PEIRCE[6] and SILVERSTEIN.[7]

To bring greater precision to discussions of language, JAKOBSON outlined six distinct functions (emotive, conative, metalinguistic, poetic, referential, phatic). Of significance to us is the poetic function, that is, where "the dominant function is the orientation towards the message" (WAUGH 1980, 58). Although it is found elsewhere, the poetic function is particularly central to poetry since there is a "radical parallelistic reorientation of all the verbal material as it relates to the building of a

---

[3] For an early example, cf. WHEELOCK 1982.

[4] For an extended discussion and critique of AUSTIN's performativity, cf. LEE 1997. Tambiah's groundbreaking analysis has been extensively supplemented and refined. Cf. Elizabeth MERTZ on the development of semiotic anthropology, MERTZ 2007.

[5] Cf. also SILVERSTEIN 1997, 269.

[6] Introductions to PEIRCE include LEE 1997, 95–134 and PARMENTIER 1994, 3–22.

[7] In addition to SILVERSTEIN 1993, cf. LEE 1997, 164–165, 174–177. For a model of using SILVERSTEIN to rework Austin cf. Sanders' study of performative in Ugaritic, SANDERS 2004.

sequence" (WAUGH 1980, 64). Ritual language emphasizes the poetic function of language since liturgy includes internal structures of all types (patterns of words, etc.). The poetic function sets up new comparisons between words that expand, rewrite, reshape or in some way alter meanings. In Roman JAKOBSON's definition "The poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection to the axis of combination" (JAKOBSON 1960, 358).

Liturgy is thus not only a conversation, but a poetic conversation. While any text can theoretically be read as part of a ritual, liturgical texts are built specially in this way, emphasizing the poetic function of language.[8] The poetic function of language operates in a hierarchical system with other functions. The Longfellow poem "Hiawatha" when read as part of a filibuster in the United States Senate is not functioning primarily as poetry (WAUGH 1980, XX).[9] So too, liturgies fulfill referential and emotive functions in addition to poetic. In the case of the Sotah (Suspected Adulteress) ritual, we will see that liturgy and literature are not oppositional but, like the functions of language, operate simultaneously with slight shifts in hierarchical priority.

Every effective use of language and signs is dependent on socially-constructed rules of use. "The illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects of courtroom testimony" as BAUMAN and BRIGGS explain, "are highly dependent, for example, on evidentiary rules and broader semiotic frames that specify admissible types of relations to other bodies of written and oral discourse" (BAUMANN/BRIGGS, 1990, 64). Linguistic functions include not only semantics (reference), and meta-semantics (words about words) but also pragmatics (contextual implications) and meta-pragmatics (words about contextual implications).[10] While the semantic/metasemantic nexus is familiar, as for example, from the case of a dictionary definition (metasemantic) of a word (semantic), the pragmatic/metapragmatic functions are less familiar. Cale JOHNSON offers a concise formulation of the metapragmatic function:

---

[8] SEGERT demonstrates very concisely the transformation of prose into poetry, as Ezek 1:26 is recast into poetry in 4Q405 20 ii-21–22 with the increased emphasis on meter and structure (1988, 222).

[9] A filibuster is a parliamentary procedure by which a single individual extends debate in order to delay or prevent a vote.

[10] Cf. in addition to SILVERSTEIN 1993, HANKS 1989, 107 and LEE 1997, 166–167, 172–174.

> In an event of metapragmatic semiosis, the object (language) consists of a snippet of language in use and the metalinguistic comment describes the degree to which this use of language is effective, felicitous, powerful and so forth, rather that then describing its semantic value (JOHNSON 2010, 3).

Happily for scholars, liturgy includes the high degree of self-reflexivity connected to performance (BAUMANN/BRIGGS 1990, 73). Performance provides a frame that invites critical reflection on communicative processes (BAUMANN/BRIGGS 1990, 60). This self-reflexivity gives us a vital window on perceived efficacy since it includes comments on how the liturgy achieves its goals.

While modern prayerbooks present prayers with fixed forms, manuscripts reveal much more fluid traditions. Like conversations, liturgy includes both fixed formulas and more improvisational sections. Establishing one main version may not be either possible or historically accurate. As one example, Raymond LEICHT's meticulous study of two manuscript versions of the Prayer of Jacob, shows that neither is "complete" or "original" (LEICHT 1999, 141). Not surprisingly, the "request" sections of liturgy, such as the Amida, are expanded with everything from requests for direct help to more esoteric appeals for special knowledge.[11] The Sotah rite, re-imagined differently in different historical periods, is an excellent example of yet another type of fluidity. Sometimes these comments point to re-interpretations of a prior rite. In the Sotah ritual, for example, two ingredients, words and water with dust in it, are given new semiotic meanings when an ancient text (Num 5:11–17) is reworked into a new version of the ritual that creates in turn a new text. The various versions constitute a case of what we might call "re-pragmatization," as the basis for the efficacy of a ritual rite is re-imagined in a later period.

The Biblical Version of the Suspected Adulteress Rite

The Sotah ritual in Num 5:11–31, part of the Deuteronomic source, is enigmatic and puzzling. Jacob MILGROM cites RAMBAN's statement that "this is the only case in biblical law where the outcome depends on a miracle" (MILGROM 1999, 350). In bare outline the rite is as follows: a sacrificial offering of barley flour (not mixed with oil) is presented to the

---

[11] SCHÄFER 1990 and SHAKED 1995, 204 describe additions to the Amidah found in a Genizah manuscript, cf. also SWARTZ 1986.

deity, the woman's hair is uncovered, holy water is mixed with dust from the floor of the sanctuary, the priest recites an oath, the woman repeats the word "Amen" twice, the priest dissolves written curses in the water and the woman drinks the "bitter" water. The priest reports that the "water and curses" will cause her "belly to distend" and "thigh to sag" if she is guilty.

This presentation of the ritual is part of a complex interweaving of narrative and laws, as is true of the entire Hebrew Scriptures. The Sotah ritual presentation is not of a specific instance of a rite being performed but like the "legal collections" is best understood as "rather artful literary representations of what the authors believed to have been the commanding voice of the divine lawgiver" (SCHWARTZ 1991, 35). We have no evidence of whether this rite was carried out, both no narrative presentations of enacting such rites and no references to their result. The rite is in effect a story about a ritual mixed in a liturgical presentation per se.[12]

The rite is replete with anomalous actions found nowhere else in Hebrew Scriptures. The structure looks like an "ordeal," that is, a rite of judgment left up to the deity due to lack of evidence. This single instance of an ordeal comes without any explanation of this type of rite or the theological motivation for it. Components of the rite are mysterious. The term "holy water," unique to this ritual, replaces the more common references to "living" (Num 19:17 and Lev 14:5f) or "pure" (Ezek 36:25) water.[13] The specific content of the verbal formula is ambiguous; Philo, Laws 3.60 and Mishnah Sotah 2:3 present different formulas. The "drinking" of curses does not appear elsewhere, nor does the use of sanctuary dust.[14]

It is no surprise that interpretations of the rite vary widely. Rabbinic commentators put their special stamp on the ritual.[15] Among other points they assumed that the woman was pregnant; the purpose of the bitter water was then to induce a miscarriage. Modern interpreters turn to similar rites in Ancient Near Eastern texts for guidance. The Code of Hammurabi includes two, LH 131, in which a husband accuses his wife of adultery and she takes an oath (structure: oath, no drink) and LH 132, in which someone

---

[12] Cf. BARUCH LEVINE's distinction between proscriptive and descriptive rituals, LEVINE 1965 and LEVINE 1983.

[13] Some commentators connect this term with the basin of water described in Ex 30:17–21 but the phrase "holy water" does not appear in that context.

[14] The special powers of dirt are mentioned in SWARTZ 2002, though in this ritual it is not dirt in general but dirt from the Tabernacle.

[15] For discussions of the rabbinic interpretations, cf. ROSEN-ZVI 2006 and BOYARIN 2000.

other than the husband accuses a woman of adultery and she leaps into a river (structure: ordeal without oath or drink; FISHBANE 1999, 494). Neither of these ways of dealing with charges of adultery encodes anything specifically about adultery. Oaths are part of many rites, as is jumping into a river. These rituals are thematically similar to Sotah, addressing adultery, but their structures are dissimilar.

Michael FISHBANE locates the closest formal parallel in Ancient Near Eastern rituals that involve not adultery but conflicting testimony by witnesses. In order to support their claims, each witness takes a special drink and swears an oath. This rite has a structure nearly identical to Sotah ("oath plus drink"). Each witness states, "Everything (?); I have drawn (water), drunk, sworn, and am pure" (VAT 9962; FISHBANE 1999, 495). The structure of this rite is completely disconnected from adultery, but it does tie the drink and oath to purification.

Sotah and these Ancient Near Eastern rites combine, in Michael FISHBANE's terminology, a "sacred act" (use of an object) with a "sacred word" (verbal formula; FISHBANE 1999, 488).[16] Not all Biblical rituals are constructed this way. The sacrificial system as presented in the Priestly source includes only actions and no words. FISHBANE is correct that some of the explanations for this presumed silence are weak, such as KAUFMAN's theory of silence as "anti-magical" (FISHBANE, 1999, 488). The lack of liturgy is still striking. Israel KNOHL argues that the Priestly Torah's silent cult emphasizes the deity's loftiness and the "spirit of the divine elements abstracted from its practical functions in the world" (1995, 148). KNOHL's theory repeats an aesthetic judgment found in some ancient texts that cultic silence is more imposing and austere than spoken forms of worship (cf. The Letter of Aristeas 95). This idealized picture of the cult suits a text far removed from actual practice. Another possible explanation is the desire by the priests to assert control over the seeming automatic efficacy of verbal formulas derived from divine speech, as discussed below.

When FISHBANE combs the Biblical texts for rituals that include verbal formulas he locates two types. The first is the very limited ritual of singing before the Ark as described in Num 10:35–36 and 1 Chr 15:26–16:36. A second set includes a small group of "acts plus words" rituals such as the oath over an unsolved homicide (Deut 21:1–9), the offering of first fruits

[16] In his footnotes FISHBANE refers to these two different modes of action as "praxis" and "incantation", cf. FISHBANE 1999, 499 n. 497.

(Deut 26:1–15) and the Sotah rite.[17] The rites can be summarized as follows:

Type	Rites
Sacred Acts only	P-Source sacrifices.
Sacred Acts and Words	Sotah ritual; unsolved homicide; first fruits.
Sacred Words in Sacred Space	Hymn-singing before the Ark.

In the rite about an unsolved homicide (Deut 21:1–9), when a corpse is found near a town, the city elders break the neck of a heifer, wash their hands and recite a negative confession:

> Our hands did not shed this blood, nor did our eyes see it done. Absolve, O Lord, your people Israel whom you redeemed and do not let guilt for the blood of the innocent remain among your people Israel.

The sacred words spoken by the elders are addressed to the deity. The priest is entirely superfluous to the rite, included in an awkward intrusion (metapragmatic statement) stating, “The priests, sons of Levi, shall come forward; for the Lord your God has chosen them to minister to Him and to pronounce blessing in the name of the Lord, and every lawsuit and case of assault.” This interpolation contradicts the rite itself, which includes no such blessing.[18] The Elders speak directly to the deity while the priest speaks to the “you” of the Israelites and the general audience beyond that includes the reader/hearer of the text.

The priest’s comment presents a theory of ritual. This interpretation shifts the emphasis of the text section from the poetic to the referential, that is, the text tells us something *about* ritual as much as other lines enact it. The ritual presentation is subordinated to a series of theological points, much as legal texts are inextricably bound with and shaped by narrative material.

The elders make their negative confession and the killing of the heifer serves as the source of blood that can then activate the purification.[19] In this case the words and the deeds work in close collaboration. The ritual is

---

[17] Another possible inclusion in this category is the recitation of the Israelites’ sins over the scapegoat in Lev 16, a rare occurrence of a verbal component in the Priestly source. The recitation of sins, however, is distinct from the formulas discussed here. On this rite cf. SCHWARTZ 1995.

[18] This claim contrasts with Lev 17:9 where Levitical priests intervene only in cases the local community cannot bring to closure.

[19] It may also serve in a secondary manner as a reverse or mirror image of the unsolved killing since this one is manifest.

then re-interpreted as working via the priest's blessing. This blessing indexes the speaker (priest) as representing the divine presence. The specific language of the blessing is missing but it must repeat the implicit theory of ritual language found throughout the Hebrew Scriptures that the deity's blessing and curses are automatically effective. Whoever recites the formula is the conduit of divine speech.

The first fruits ceremony (Deut 26:1–15) combines a short liturgy said to the priest ("I acknowledge this day before the Lord your God that I have entered the land that the Lord swore to our fathers to assign us", verses 1–4), and one said directly to the deity ("My father was a wandering Aramean…", verses 5–10), followed by the leaving of a basket before the Lord. The initial formula said to the priest interrupts the sequence of the rite and thus probably is a priestly addition. The short historical recitation spoken before the altar (verses 5–10) presumes an individual speaker ("My father was"), a national group for whom the deity has done miracles ("we cried to the Lord" verse 7) and addresses the deity in the second person as listener ("You").

The rite is put under the control of the priest by his interruption into the conversation with the deity and his taking of the basket, despite the later instruction that the original speaker places the offering before the deity. The priest remains without a speaking role; his only action is the placing of the basket. A third, this time negative, confession (verses 13–15, "I have not eaten…") appears to have lost its connection to a holy site (sanctuary) and is now spoken in a non-specified site after having given the tithe to a Levite, stranger, etc. The table below summarizes the rituals we have discussed so far.

	Sacred Acts	Sacred Words	Metapragmatic interpretations
Homicide	Heifer killed and washing of hands over its blood	Confession: 'Our hands have not shed blood, Lord.'	Explicit addition: The priest's recitation of the blessing makes it effective.
First fruits	1.Leaving of basket before deity 2. Handing of basket to priest	1. Spoken to deity: My father was … first fruits you gave me 2. Spoken to priest: I recognize … before your deity	Level 2 implicates priest in efficacy.
Biblical Sotah	Drink water with dust and words Woman brings grain sacrifice	Priest recites curses twice Woman recites "Amen" twice	Explicit added reference to deity.

The very fact that these formulas can be said by any male descendant of an "Aramean", and that they directly address the deity in a cultic setting, points to one of the potential problems with liturgy for priests: the lack of any need for priestly mediation. Verbal formulas spoken directly to the deity deny priests any specific role in invoking the divine presence. One might think that the conversation was being held directly between the individual and the deity with no mediating role for a priest. In distinction, the "sacred acts" of priestly sacrifice can by definition only be carried out by a priest. Verbal formulas, modeled on divine speech and including second person invoking of divine presence, may appear, at least from the priests' point of view, to imply too much access to divine power on the part of the speaker.

In the case of the Sotah rite, we find an interpolated commentary on the rite and its efficacy. An awkward addition (verse 21) states, "here the priest shall administer the curse of adjuration to the woman, as the priest goes on to say to the woman 'May the Lord make you a curse and an imprecation among your people, as the Lord causes your thigh to sag and your belly to distend.'" This metapragmatic interpretation explains how the rite works. The reference to the deity's role, as noted above, stresses the "deity-invoking" power of the priest, who as the ritual authority can explain what is happening. Efficacy is dependent on the priest's presence since it in turn instantiates the deity's presence as well.

MILGROM argued that the interruption is needed to stress that the deity makes the curse efficacious, not the water itself (MILGROM 1999, 353). It is more accurate to state that whoever added it had this theory, an implicit

misunderstanding of a prior version of the ritual. In no setting was the water thought to work by itself: it was understood to have a semiotic (symbolic) function, even if that function were already lost or misunderstood in the ancient world. The holy water contains both dust from the sanctuary and the dissolved curse, meaning that it might be understood to represent divinity as an indexical icon (a formal representation with spatio-temporal contiguity), even twice over.

Much as the written Torah gives a new form of materiality to divine speech, in the Sotah rite the written words are dissolved, exchanging one type of materiality for another. In this action the linguistic ideology of the Biblical text is worked in reverse. The Torah is a collection of spoken words, uttered by the deity to Moses and thus to the Israelites. The entire text is reported speech, as the deity repeatedly says, "Say unto the people…" The text represents divinity in written form because it is literally the deity's words. Some of the words may best be understood as spoken by the deity to Moses alone, but all are divine. The woman will now be able to take divine presence in its new materiality directly into her body, making her entire body into a "golden indexical"[20] of divine power. This power will either purify or deform her.

Why does the suspected adulteress have to drink the water in the first place? Parallel Ancient Near Eastern ordeals of oath and drink for witnesses have disappeared. In the case of the oath taken over the unsolved homicide, the core of the rite is the purification (washing hands and confession) and no threat is made against the elders if they lie under oath (their tongues will fall out). But the Sotah rite as both purification and punishment is insisted upon, leaving everyone to wonder how exactly the punishment part of the rite works (Does she die? Lose a pregnancy? Lose future fertility?). Here the basic question of the role of the ordeal looms large. This question cannot be answered in the abstract since ordeals are interpreted in numerous ways in different settings. As Peter BROWN writes about the 12th century community use of ordeals, "it found in this particular form of the mingling of sacred and profane an elegant and appropriate solution to some of its problems" (BROWN, 182, 317). Each iteration of ordeal rituals reflects a distinct theological stance that must be reconstructed based on the specific historical settings and guidelines.

Ordeals are not best understood as quasi-medical procedures, despite the tempting reference to sagging thighs and distended bellies.[21] The

---

[20] For the term, cf. PARMENTIER 1997, 77.
[21] For a medicalized interpretation of the ritual, cf. FRYMER-KENSKY 1984.

suspected adulteress rite appears after a discussion of rules for the removal and readmission of people who became impure from the cult and the Tabernacle. It does not appear in the midst of other family laws.[22] Concerns of purity outweigh family matters. Some modern commentators argue that the purpose of the ordeal is to save the woman from sure death; they ignore the husband's right in the parallel Ancient Near Eastern rituals to waive his claim entirely. In the biblical setting this possibility is eliminated since the dramatic struggle over the woman's body is only tangentially related to the husband's concerns. He has no role in deciding whether or not she should undergo the priest's rite of purification and so the husband cannot waive his claim. This ordeal is theological, not practical.

Purification is obligatory since otherwise contamination may spread from the woman's body into the entire Israelite "body", including the priests'. If she is guilty of that contamination, the entire balance is off between the Israelites and their deity. The ritual serves as a warning story about the threat of female sexuality and the power of the deity, and only the deity, to contain it. The ordeal is a divine solution to a problem that transcends the husband and demands the priest.

In the dramatic struggle over the woman, who stands metaphorically for all the "adultery" of the Israelites, only the deity can quash suspicion. The woman's body must be brought in contiguity with divine forces because purification entails direct contact. The purification of the woman's body has to be specified formally and the specification, the holy water passing through her body, is the core of the entire rite. The movement of the water through her body assigns her to either sacred or cursed status. The water re-claims the woman's body for the deity since sacred and profane cannot inhabit the same body. Just as ceramic utensils are used in cases of corpse contamination (Num 19:17ff),[23] here too the ceramic vessels signify that purification is taking place. In other cases blood can be the cleansing agent (Lev 14:5), but not when the contamination of a woman's body is at issue. The theological weight of these concerns shifts the texts from the poetic function to the referential that tells a story of the full power the rite employs.

---

[22] Injunctions and laws of marriage appear in Deut 22:13–29 and Lev 2:10–21.

[23] Cf. LEVINE 1993, 105.

The Suspected Adulteress Revisited: A Medieval Version

A fascinating medieval version of the ritual found in Genizah fragments is precious evidence of how the metapragmatic basis shifted when someone tried to enact the ritual.[24] The text includes an explicit commentary and meditation on the biblical version. The new version moves away from issues of purification and towards a new mapping of divine power on earth. Since the officiant is not a priest, his authority and credentials must be established.

In basic outline, the text includes 1) a history of the divine Names used in creation, passed down by angels to humans, 2) an explanation of the Names' roles (how they function in the Sotah rite), 3) a presentation of the Names (technical verb for their use "abjure", letters that make up the Names) and 4) and explanation of the current form of the rite (what we do now and why it works) and an appended comment on the elevated status of the officiant (like an angel, a High Priest).

Here we see a dramatic instance of "the interpenetrations of textual with extratextual factors" (HANKS 1989, 105). It is nearly impossible to separate out the rite from the metapragmatic commentary mixed in with it. Presumably, just as earlier versions of ordeals looked "magical" to the priestly editors, the redactors of this version had questions about causation. In order to make the ritual work, an alternative to priestly status must be presented and the liturgy is "re-pragmatized."

The Genizah text opens with the formula "Blessed is the name of glory of his kingdom forever and ever."[25] This blessing formula is a clear example of the way certain linguistic forms "laminate all four areas [linguistic, metalinguistic, pragmatic and metapragmatic] on top of one another" (SANDERS 2004, 170). This act of blessing is based on a passive participle instead of on a first-person verb. The speaker is informing everyone of the blessed status of the divine Name. This form may have something to do with the shift whereby the form of the perfect tense becomes marked for past tense, and the imperfect for future, as Sanders explains, with the result that the participial form becomes the unmarked form, suitable for constructing performatives (SANDERS 2004).[26]

---

[24] According to SCHÄFER the fragments were probably written in the 11–12th centuries, cf. SCHÄFER 1990, 542. Cf. also SWARTZ 2002.

[25] On the historical emergence of this formula in rabbinic circles, cf. KIMELMAN 2005.

[26] Cf. the discussions in ROGLAND 1999 and ROGLAND 2001.

Even with this insight, the question still remains as to why "declaring the name blessed" is a liturgical fulcrum. We saw that the biblical texts confine automatic efficacy to divine blessings and curses. SANDERS' point about Ugaritic texts also applies to Biblical texts: "divine language is self-enacting … Human language … does not work the same way … it must work through modeling" (181). In the Ugaritic example divine language is condensed in the act of divine naming, that is, "proclaiming." When, in an Ugaritic narrative presentation, the deity gives names to weapons, the act of naming has metapragmatic force. The weapons subsequently function as divine names since "[t]he self-activating verbs stored in the weapons' names are thus icons of self-performing actions" (SANDERS 2004, 174).

The Jewish divine Name ideology is distinct but related; the divine name functions as the central "self-performing" linguistic form and thus as the basis of the ritual efficacy. This rite has a very particular notion of "calling upon the deity's name." In the most basic Jewish prayer formulas the "blessedness" of the name is invoked, instantiating the blessedness of the one whose name it is. Invoking the blessed Name is a human appropriation of a divine prerogative by the sleight-of-hand of reported speech. Like forms of politeness that imply obligations of those towards whom the words are directed, each declaration of the blessedness of the name presupposes that the source of blessings (the deity) has already done the blessing. The human speaker is simply pointing this out, but the act of pointing it out is a form of "received performativity."

The text follows this usage with another linguistic form that operates from a modified metapragmatic stance: the direct uttering of divine Names. Here the "you" whose name is blessed is invoked in the third person. This might seem to be a less direct invocation than "you", but due to the encoding of divine power in the divine Name, it is a parallel mode of pointing to and putting into action of divine power. It is misguided to say that only a certain type of person, let alone a disparaged "magician", adopts this type of metapragmatics, since the power of the divine Name is so central to Jewish theology. What separates this text from other liturgical forms is that this text has obsessive concerns about efficacy of a different sort than we saw with the priests. This is a moment requiring explication and elaboration. Names are fussed with as if to say: The power of the divine Names is not a simple issue of one or two letters, but instead is so mystifying and so complicated it is almost beyond even us (and is surely

beyond you). The story of the passing down of the name is a narrative presentation of efficacy that encodes the secrecy, raising the fascinating issue of the role of secrecy in religion much beyond the scope of this paper.[27] The claim to secrecy is itself part of the metapragmatics.

The use of the written curses dissolved in water has also been reinterpreted, since they too have been subordinated not to the priest, but to the divine Name. All "self-enacting" power is now the power of the divine Name, both written and spoken. While biblical texts seemed to have limited theories of effective human speech, this interpretation of the rite seems to have a very limited theory of effective "sacred acts." That is, the divine Name threatens to displace all sacred acts, leading to ritual where the "actions" (adding dust, drinking water) are subordinated to the "words" (and specifically, the divine Name).

The theory of divine language in the revised Sotah rite meshes closely with the transformational possibility inherent in this version of Jewish theology. The biblical idea of hereditary priestly identity contrasts with the reformulated, and now distinctly fluid, categories of identity. As noted by recent scholars, in Late Antiquity gender was an achieved status and thus had to be repeatedly confirmed.[28] Men could potentially degrade themselves into women, and so too, women could achieve male status even if this did not occur on a regular basis. So too the human-divine continuum marked out many stages of human into divine status (and the reverse) as outlined in the following table.[29]

Material world	Intelligible world	Cosmos beyond language
fleshly bodies	less fleshly bodies	no bodies
human sphere	more divine/less human sphere	divine sphere
humans (most men, all women)	gods special men heavenly bodies angels (male) divine powers	Deity
human by nature	immortal by gift from Deity	divine by nature

[27] Some of the central themes are outlined in URBAN 2006.
[28] Cf. SATLOW 1996 and MOORE/ANDERSON 1998.
[29] Aristotle's schema from FREDE 1999 combined with Philo's terminology taken from RUNIA 1988.

Transformations along this human-divine spectrum are presented in numerous ancient texts beginning in the first century BCE, effected after death via burial (SMITH 1990) and even while still alive.[30] Moving towards the divine end was achieved by "sacred acts", "sacred words", and by combinations of these. The striking story of the daughters of Job transforming into divine beings by their use of a divine belt (Testament of Job 38:3) is an example employing only a sacred "act". Other ritual strategies include purifications via water or blood, visualizations, divine inspiration, recitation of key liturgical texts (Isa 6:3), recitation of divine names and breathing techniques. Liturgy, where the poetic function of language is put in the service of transformation of the speaker, is by far the most common. Singing heavenly songs and speaking the divine name in any form indexed the changed status of the speaker: the more powerful and secret the Name, the more heightened the status of the speaker.

In the later Sotah rite the power of the entire priestly system accrues to the person doing the rite who is now able, as a divine figure himself, to carry it out. Without this status, the rite cannot be efficacious. The ordeal depends not only on the deity but also on the divine status of the officiant. This claim does not of course mean that every person thought he was a deity, or even that practitioners did not reserve some dimension of difference between their status and that of the deity.[31] It does mean, however, that the priestly caste has been replaced by individuals who earn their special status.

We have seen how dependent we are on interpretations that are included within the presentation of rituals since these are moments where semiotic meaning is fixed, at least temporarily. The Sotah rite shifts back and forth between the "liturgy" of prayers and the "literature" of commentary. Distinguishing liturgy from literature is a question of hierarchy not absolute difference.

Bibliography

ALEXANDER, L.: Images of empire (JSOT 122), 1991.

---

[30] The secondary literature on this is immense, though much of it mislabels these transformations as either heretical or magical. Discussions run from NOCK 1972 to FLETCHER-LOUIS 2002.

[31] On the etiquette that demands keeping some hierarchical distinction between various types of divine figures and the deity, cf. CHAZON 2000.

AUSTIN, J. L.: How to do Things with Words (The William James lectures 1955), Cambridge 1962.
BAUMANN, R. et al.: Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life. In: Annual Review of Anthropology 19 (1990), 59–88.
BOYARIN, D.: Women's Bodies and the Rise of the Rabbis: The Case of Sotah. In: Jews and Gender. The Challenge to Hierarchy, ed. J. FRANKEL (Studies in Contemporary Jewry 16), Oxford et al. 2000, 88–100.
BROWN, P.: Society and the holy in late antiquity, London 1982.
CHAZON, E.: Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran. In: Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetic Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet (StTDJ 35), ed. D. FALK et al., Leiden 2000, 95–105.
FISHBANE, M.: Accusations of Adultery. A Study of Law and Scribal Practice in Numbers 5:11–31. In: Women in the Hebrew Bible. A reader, ed. A. BACH, New York 1999, 487–502.
FLETCHER-LOUIS, C. H. T.: All the glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls (StTDJ 42), Leiden 2002.
FREDE, M.: Monotheism and Pagan Philosophy in Later Antiquity. In Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity, ed. P. ATHANASSIADI et al., Oxford 1999, 41–67.
FRYMER-KENSKY, T.: The Strange Case of the Suspected Sotah (VT 34), Leiden 1984, 11–26.
HANKS, W.: Text and Textuality. In: Annual Review of Anthropology 18 (1989), 95–127.
JAKOBSON, R.: Linguistics and Poetics. In: Style in Language, ed. T. SEBEOK, New York 1960, 350–377.
JOHNSON, J. C.: Indexical Iconicity in Sumerian Belles Lettres, 2010.
KIMELMAN, R.: Blessing Formulae and Divine Sovereignty in Rabbinic Liturgy. In: Liturgy in the Life of the Synagogue: Studies in the Hisotry of Jewish Prayer, ed. R. LANGER et al., Winona Lake 2005, 1–39.
KNOHL, I.: The Sanctuary of Silence. The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School, Minneapolis 1995.
LEE, B.: Talking heads. Language, Metalanguage, and the Semiotics of Subjectivity. Durham 1997.
LEICHT, R.: Qedushah and Prayer to Helios. A New Hebrew Version of an Apocryphal Prayer to Jacob. In: JSQ 6 (1999), 140–176.
LEVINE, B.: The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch (JAOS 85), Baltimore 1965, 307–318.
– The Descriptive Ritual Texts from Ugarit. Some Formal and Functional Features of the Genre. In: The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth. Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Sixtieth Birthday (ASOR, Special Volume Series 1), ed. C. L. MEYERS et al., Philadelphia, PA 1983, 467–475.
– Numbers 1–20. A new Translation with Introduction and Commentary (The Anchor Bible 4), New York 1993.
MERTZ, E.: Semiotic Anthropology. In: Annual Review of Anthropology 36 (2007), 337–353.
MILGROM, J.: The Case of the Suspected Adultress, Numbers 5:11–31. Redaction and Meaning. In: Women in the Bible. A Reader, ed. A. BACH, New York 1999, 475–482.
MOORE, S./ANDERSON, J. C.: Taking it Like a Man: Masculinity in 4 Maccabees. In: JBL 117 (1998), 249–273.

NOCK, A. D.: Deification and Julian. In: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World. Selected and Edited with an Introduction Bibliography of Nock's Writing by Zeph Stewart. Vol. 2, Cambridge, MA 1972.

PARMENTIER, R.: Signs in society. Studies in semiotic anthropology, Bloomington 1994.

– The Pragmatic Semiotics of Cultures (Semiotica 116), Berlin – New York 1997, 1–115.

ROGLAND, M.: A Note on Performative Utterances in Qumran Aramaic. In: RdQ 19 (1999), 277–280.

– Performative Utterances in Classical Syriac. In: JSSt 46 (2001), 243–250.

ROSALDO, M.: The Things We Do With Words. Ilongot Speech Acts and Speech Act Theory in Philosophy. In: Language in Society 11 (1982), 203–237.

ROSEN-ZVI, I.: Measure for Measure as a Hermeneutical Tool in Early Rabbinic Literature: The Case of Sotah. In: JJS 57 (2006), 269–286.

RUNIA, D.: God and Man in Philo of Alexandria. In: JThS 39 (1988), 48–75.

SANDERS, S.: Performative Utterances and Divine Language in Ugarite. In: JNES 63 (2004), 161–181.

SATLOW, M.: Try to be a Man. The Rabbinic Construction of Masculinity. In: HthR 89 (1996), 18–40.

SCHÄFER, P.: Jewish Magic Literature in Late Antiquity and Early Modern Ages. In: JJS 41 (1990), 75–91.

SCHWARTZ, B.: The Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood in Leviticus 17. In: Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel (JSOTS 125), G. ANDERSON et al., Sheffield 1991, 34–66.

– The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature. In: Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish and Ancient Near Eastern Ritual, Law and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom, ed. D. WRIGHT et al., Winona Lake 1995, 3–21.

SEARLE, J. R.: Speech acts. An essay in the philosophy of language, Cambridge 1969.

SHAKED, S.: Peace be unto You, Exalted Angels. On Hekhalot, Liturgy and Incantation Bowls. In: JSQ 2 (1995), 197–219.

SILVERSTEIN, M.: Metapragmatic Discourse and Metapragmatic Function. In: Reflexive Language. Reported Speech and Metapragmatics, ed. J. LUCY, Cambridge 1993, 33–58.

– The Improvisational Performance of Culture in Realtime. Discursive Practice. In: Creativity in Performance, ed. K. SAWYER, Greenwich 1997, 265–312.

SMITH, M.: Ascent to the Heavens and Deification. In 4QM[a]. In: Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin. [1985] New York University (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement series 8 = JSOT/ASOR Monographs [N.S.] 2), ed. L. SCHIFFMAN, Sheffield 1990, 181–188.

SWARTZ, M. D.: Sacrifical Themes in Jewish Magic. In: Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World, ed. P. MIRECKI et al., Leiden 2002, 303–315.

– *'Alay le-Shabbeaḥ*. A Liturgical Prayaer in *Ma'aśseh Merkabah*. In: JQR 77 (1986), 179–190.

URBAN, H. B.: Fair Game. Secrecy, Security, and the Church of Scientology in Cold War America. In: JAAR 74 (2006), 356–389.

WAUGH, L.: The Poetic Function in the Theory of Roman Jakobson. In: Poetics Today 2 (1980), 57–82.

WHEELOCK, W.: The Problem of Ritual Language. From Information to Situation. In: JAAR 50 (1982), 49–71.

Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts at Qumran

DANIEL K. FALK

The purpose of this article is to examine the prayer scrolls found at Qumran as artifacts related to the practice of prayer, and to consider what light they may shed on the broader social context of prayer among the Jews who produced and owned these objects.[1] Besides providing by far the richest source for early Jewish prayer – with more than two hundred different prayers and religious poems previously unknown – the Qumran evidence is especially important for providing examples of scrolls of liturgical prayers, that is, collections of prayers for corporate worship.[2] This is data that is otherwise almost completely missing for ancient Judaism prior to the medieval liturgical texts found in the Karaite synagogue genizah in Cairo.[3] It is also rare more generally in the Greco-Roman world.

In order to appreciate the unique significance of the evidence for prayer at Qumran – not only for the history of Jewish prayer but for the phenomenology of prayer in the ancient world more generally – it is important to make a distinction that is the focus of this symposium, between prayer as a

---

[1] I acknowledge with gratitude the organizers and supporters of the Literature or Liturgy Symposium. Parts of this article were completed during 2011–12 while supported by a Summer Stipend for Humanities and Creative Arts Faculty at the University of Oregon, and as a Harold Hyam Wingate Fellow at the Oxford Center for Hebrew and Jewish Studies and Visiting Scholar at Wolfson College, Oxford.

[2] For surveys of the Qumran prayers, cf. CHAZON 1998, 244–270; FALK, Cambridge 1999, 852–876; SCHULLER 2004, 411–428.

[3] E.g., cf. REIF 1993, 143–145. The essential elements of synagogue prayer are assumed and discussed in the Talmuds, but there are no liturgical manuscripts from the Talmudic period. The earliest rabbinic prayer book known to us is the Seder Rav Amram Gaon from the ninth c. CE, but apart from fragments in the Cairo Geniza, it survives only in later manuscripts. The absence of earlier prayer books is often explained as due to a rabbinic ban on writing prayers that was effective until about the 8th century, e.g., GINZBERG 1909, 119–121. But it is doubtful that the rabbis had such control over the practices of Jewish communities in late antiquity.

religious practice and texts of prayers in literary contexts.[4] There is more to the phenomena of prayers than the words spoken, and much of the data about the physical and social aspects of ancient prayer is lost to us. For the purposes of this paper, prayer in general refers to human communication with the divine, and liturgical prayer refers to prayer as part of a system of rituals for public or corporate performance as a religious service.[5] Although prayer is not a text,[6] a scroll used in some way in the performance of or preparation for a ritual constitutes a material artifact of prayer. As such, the Qumran liturgical scrolls uniquely open a window onto the material culture of early Jewish prayer. The physical materials used and the techniques employed by the scribe[7] represent choices that are informed by the socio-religious context. Thus the manner of production provides valuable information about the significance of prayer and the larger social context. Rather than focusing on the content of the prayers themselves, we will explore the physical realia of writing and handling prayer texts. To date, this valuable evidence has received little attention.[8]

This study will begin with a brief survey of the material culture of prayer in the Greco-Roman world in order to contextualize the evidence from Qumran, and to sharpen sensitivity to the range of potential evidence. The main part of the study will examine the physical features of liturgical scrolls from Qumran. Were prayer scrolls treated in any special way? From the scrolls on which individuals copied prayers, and from which they learned prayers and perhaps recited in public worship, what can we learn about the praying community?

Material Culture of Prayer in the Greco-Roman World

In the Greco-Roman world, written prayers appeared in various forms and served various purposes, well surveyed by Matthias KLINGHARDT.[9] Much

---

[4] On the relationship between prayers in literary contexts and real prayer, cf. PULLEYN 1997, 1–3.

[5] These definitions are adapted from GILL 1987 and JENNINGS 1987.

[6] Cf. JEANES 1993, 9–10; 9–27.

[7] I use the term "scribe" loosely for convenience without implication about the training or profession of the person writing the scroll. For a discussion of terminology and issues involved, cf. TOV 2004, 7–8.

[8] For a recent survey of research on Qumran prayer, cf. FALK 2010, 617–651.

[9] KLINGHARDT 1999, 1–52. Cf. also the brief anthology of Greco-Roman prayer in KILEY 1997, 123–204.

of the surviving material culture of prayer from the Greco-Roman world consists of public prayer texts in the form of inscriptions: funerary engravings, dedication and honorific plaques, and commemorative stelai. Such prayers may have been spoken at installation, but otherwise were for public display, to be read by others, and perhaps to serve as a continual prayer before the deity.[10] A Jewish example is the epitaph of Heraclea at Rheneia, from the second or first century BCE, that summons God to curse the murderer of Heraclea.[11] There are also many graffiti prayers.[12] A famous Jewish example is the thanksgiving graffiti of Theodotus at the Temple of Pan at El-Kanais in Egypt, from the second or first century BCE: "Bless God. Theodotus son of Dorion, the Jew, returned safely from overseas."[13]

More relevant to the Qumran prayers are Greco-Roman cult liturgies inscribed on tablets including ritual instructions, prayers, and hymns for specific occasions.[14] Two examples are especially instructive. The first is a Greek inscription from the sanctuary of the healing god Asclepius at Erythrae in Asia Minor, dated 380–360 BCE.[15] One side of the stone prescribes ritual procedures for sacrifice before and after incubation by the one seeking healing, including a song of thanksgiving (*paean*).

> Everybody who sacrifices to Asclepius and to Apollo after the incubation or everybody who redeems his vows with a sacrifice, each of them shall, before he puts the holy parts (of the meat) on the altar, each of them shall first perform the paean around the altar three times: Ie Paion, o ie Paion… (obverse lines 30–40).[16]

The reverse contains the text of paeans to Apollo (lines 41–55) and Asclepius (lines 56–73), with a paean to Seleukos added at the bottom about a century later in 281 BCE. The Erythraean paean to Asclepius is the earliest

---

[10] E.g., a Latin inscription on an altar in Narbo (11 CE) promises annual sacrifices and prayer to Caesar Augustus by the community in fulfillment of a vow, and includes a dedicatory prayer. Cf. SCHOWALTER 1997, 159–164.

[11] NOY 2004, Ach 70, 235–239.

[12] There is a great wealth of such graffiti prayers from antiquity. E.g., the Safaitic DB Online (http://krcfm.orient.ox.ac.uk/fmi/iwp/cgi?-db=AALC_BDRS&-loadframes) so far lists 432 graffiti prayers in an ancient North Arabian dialect inscribed on basalt stones in the Syro-Arabian desert, dating between 1st c. BCE–4th c. CE. These are typically simple petitions for security and prosperity.

[13] HORBURY/NOY 1992, 207–209, no. 121 (=CIJ 2: 1537); cf. also 209–210, no. 122 (=CIJ 2:1538).

[14] KLINGHARDT 1999, 7–9.

[15] ENGELMANN 1973, 331–341.

[16] Cited from KLINGHARDT 1999, 9.

known copy of this hymn, which continued to be used for centuries at different sanctuaries, as attested by copies at Athens, Dium in Macedonia, and Ptolemais in Egypt, dating to the 1st–2nd c. CE.[17] In the Erythraean inscription, the stonecutter laid out the text to end lines with the cry ἰὲ Παιάν (the *epiphthegma*), leaving the rest of these lines blank.[18] The other copies are laid out similarly, as well as another paean from the Asclepieion at Athens (1st–2nd c. CE copy, composed probably 1st c. BCE), which leaves a space before the *epiphthegma* at the end of lines "perhaps to facilitate a choral response to a solo performance or audience response to a choral performance."[19] Thus, this example illustrates a text for liturgical use in a public setting that includes ritual instructions, and laid out seemingly to facilitate its ritual use.[20] The subsequent addition of the paean to Seleukos illustrates the growth of a collection of hymns. There is much evidence, both literary and epigraphic, that the Asclepius cult generated numerous liturgical hymns.[21]

As a second example, the Iguvine Tablets consist of seven bronze sheets from Umbria engraved on both sides with religious rituals of a priestly fraternity.[22] They detail sacrifices and prayers at purification rituals and feasts, including rubrics specifying exact words (e.g., "use this formula," "thus pray during the libation"). The rituals include a ceremonial mustering of the community with blessings, and ritual expulsion and cursing of traditional enemies. The earliest tablets, dating from the third century BCE, were written with the Umbrian alphabet; the latest, written in Latin characters in the first century BCE, expand on the rituals of an earlier tablet. At least some of the tablets were mounted for public display.

A third example is the Carmen Arvale, a Latin chant of the Arval priests of ancient Rome.[23] This chant survives because it was inscribed on a marble slab that publicly displayed the protocols of the priestly fraternity, including instructions for the annual festival of Ambarvalia held in a sacred

---

[17] Cf. KÄPPEL 1992, 371.

[18] FARAONE 2011, 212–214, and n. 19; cf. 208.

[19] FARAONE 2011, 217.

[20] FARAONE 2011, 207 also notes that "references in Plato and in Aelius Aristides suggest that individuals could also compose and perform these types of paeans in more private settings."

[21] For a list of the evidence, cf. HALDANE 1963, 54 n. 2, 53–56. With the Asclepius cult, there is a well-defined liturgical context, inscribed liturgical texts *in situ* with ritual instructions, a cultic space, and a liturgy known from literary texts.

[22] PFIFFIG 1964.

[23] CHAPOT 2001, 233–234.

grove near Rome involving sacrifice, a ritual dance and chanted prayer for fertility of the plowed fields. It refers to communal recitation of the chant using books. Although the inscription dates to 218 CE, the archaic language of the chant indicates that it dates from before the fourth century BCE. Most importantly for our purposes, here we have reference to the use of sacred books of prayer used in ritual, although none have survived for us.

The other major category of analogous texts that survive from the Greco-Roman period is "magical" texts (although it is questionable whether one can meaningfully distinguish magic and religious practice in many cases). These include numerous curse tablets, binding spells, and amulets of various sorts, seeking protection, healing, the punishment of an enemy, or the return of a lost item.[24] The objects themselves may be costly or simple (gold, silver, lead, or tin tablets; gemstones; pottery shards), and the inscriptions on them may be crudely executed or the skilled work of a professional. In most of these cases, the written text is not for recitation but serves as an object of power, and may be sealed up, worn on the body, or deposited somewhere significant. With these, it would be worth comparing the inscriptions on weapons and musical instruments described in the War Scroll (1QM 3–6). Of greater relevance are the "Greek magical papyri" from Greco-Roman Egypt (2nd c. BCE–5th c. CE), which preserve many "magical spells and formulae, hymns and rituals."[25] These represent collections of diverse materials, probably copied by magicians and/or scholars for their own use and study.

Of actual liturgical manuscripts comparable to those found at Qumran there is relatively little contemporary that has survived. Jan BREMER laments that almost all of the Greek songs that were used in the cult are lost, and he is able to summarize the few fragments of extant cultic hymns in short compass, including: the Cretan Hymn to the Kouros; the Skolion to Pan; The Paean Erythraeus; and the Paean to Hygieia.[26] Some liturgical hymns were preserved in literary contexts, and on some inscriptions.[27] (Incidentally, this re-use of hymns in secondary contexts – literary compilations, public inscriptions – is important evidence to the complica-

---

[24] E.g., cf. GAGER 1992. On cursing as prayer, cf. PULLEYN 1997, 6.

[25] BETZ 1997. Cf. GRAF 1991, 188–197.

[26] BREMER 1981, 203–215. For the texts and commentary, cf. FURLEY/BREMER 2001. On the *Sitz im Leben* of Greek prayer, cf. PULLEYN 1997, 156–195.

[27] E.g., cf. CHAPOT/LAUROT 2001; a scan of the Table of Contents shows that the vast majority are literary texts, with some inscriptions.

ted afterlife of liturgical texts). Yet there is evidence that there must have been many liturgical manuscripts in antiquity now lost. Especially important are numerous references to the use of books of prayers and hymns in Hellenistic voluntary associations and guilds, and Greco-Roman mystery cults.[28] The Iguvine Tablets mentioned above allow a hint of what a liturgical book of a voluntary association roughly contemporary to the Qumran scrolls might have looked like, and there is considerable scope for comparison: prayers for a specific occasion with ritual directions and formulaic rubrics. The references to books of prayer provide some information as to their purpose and use, including training for choirs, public performance of prayer either by a leader or in unison, and study. Sometimes prayers were specially commissioned from a famous poet (e.g., Pindar) for a certain occasion.

In consideration of this broader context in the Hellenistic world, the Qumran liturgical scrolls are not unusual for the practices they attest so much as for what survives: it is a surprise to find prayer scrolls actually extant, and especially scrolls of prose prayers. They provide evidence, then, not only for the study of Jewish prayer, but also for the broader phenomenon of the use of prayer texts in voluntary associations in the Hellenistic world, yielding the most useful examples. The Qumran evidence is unusual, however, in the complete lack of inscribed prayers, whether funerary, dedicatory, or amulets. This absence is worthy of consideration (although we must consider the *tefillin* in the category of amulets).

Evaluation of KLINGHARDT's Argument

Before we turn to examine the Qumran data, I wish to sharpen the focus by considering the provocative arguments by Matthias KLINGHARDT in his article. First, KLINGHARDT finds evidence for a similar use of fixed formularies in public prayer in Greco-Roman religion, Judaism, and Christianity, and argues that this "indicates an analogous religious mentality."[29] Second, he argues that in each of the traditions, the efficacy of the prayer depends on adherence to an obligatory fixed wording, which points to a magical character of prayer. This is especially secured by written prayers. Third, he concludes that the efficacy of formularies is virtually the same in Judaism, Christianity, and Greco-Roman religions, and derives from the idea that

---

[28] KLINGHARDT 1999, 6–11.
[29] KLINGHARDT 1999; on the points below, cf. 31–42.

the formulary is ancient and divinely revealed. Therefore prayer formulas belong to arcane knowledge restricted to those who are worthy, and there is an emphasis on secrecy. Rejecting apologetic distinctions between Jewish, Christian, and pagan prayer, he argues that in all three prayer is predominantly not free and spontaneous but, like magic, must conform to proper form in order to be effective.

There is much in this treatment that rings true. His opposition to apologetic treatments of Jewish and Christian prayer vis-a-vis pagan prayer is appropriate, but it seems that he over-reads the evidence in one direction. This leads him to read especially the Jewish evidence very selectively, running rough-shod over periods of significant developments (1st c. – talmudic period), and misreading some sources. For example, mBer 5:5 has an anecdote about R. Hanina b. Dosa, a renowned miracle-worker of the first century CE. According to this text, if R. Hanina was praying for a sick person and his prayer was "fluent in his mouth," he knew that his prayer would be accepted and the person would be healed. The phrase also occurs in mBer 4:3: if one's prayer is not "fluent in his mouth" one prays a short form of the Eighteen Benedictions. KLINGHARDT points to these passages as evidence for flawless recitation of a fixed formula of prayer, but this is not how the early rabbis used the expression "fluent in mouth." Rather it has to do with their ideal of prayer as not a fixed task but improvised from the heart. Fixed prayer was more of a concession to those for whom prayer was not fluent; the early rabbinic ideal was innovation, making the prayer ever new.

One should distinguish between a concern for appropriate wording versus magical efficacy: written texts do not necessarily imply magical efficacy of words, but are a necessity for corporate recitation. Also, KLINGHARDT's notion of secrecy with regard to prayer formularies does not apply well to the majority of Jewish evidence. Although it is later than our time period, rabbinic sources show a concern that people be able to pray corporately. Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is notable that although there are texts written in cryptic texts, there are only a few tiny possible fragments of prayers or psalms among these. KLINGHARDT puzzlingly refers to 1QHa as an example, but this is not in any sense an arcane text, and it has multiple copies in diverse formats. Prayer texts at Qumran generally – even ones we might expect to be arcane such as exorcism songs for the *Maskil* – are seemingly not treated as arcane. Also, as we will see, they are the most common texts to be copied as personal texts.

On the other hand, some of KLINGHARDT's assertions ring true at Qumran, especially the idea of prayer as divinely revealed, and prayer as returning divine language. There is much that is very useful in this survey, but I find that he has forced the evidence somewhat in emphasis on part of the

picture. The observations he makes are there in the traditions, but the traditions are more diverse.

Liturgical Manuscripts From Qumran

We turn now to consider the physical characteristics of liturgical manuscripts at Qumran. Much of the data is gathered in the catalogue of scribal practices compiled by Emanuel TOV and in the indices to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series (DJD).[30] The fragmentary nature of the manuscripts, however, makes it impossible to produce accurate figures on the number of works, their genres, measurements, and other details. Thus, all statistics and comparisons are at best very approximate.

Acknowledging the extreme uncertainties in counting these fragmentary texts, we may estimate that about 870 total scrolls are attested among the fragments from Qumran, containing about 900 copies of distinct works.[31] Of these, there are about 90 scrolls of prayers and religious poetry, not including many cases of various prayers and rituals contained or referred to in works of other genres (according to my count, there are 89 scrolls, and since two are opisthographs with different prayer collections on each side these contain 91 prayer works). The fragmentary nature of most of these scrolls makes it extremely difficult in some cases to classify them. The following list follows in most regards the categorized inventory by Armin LANGE, with some differences.[32]

---

[30] TOV 2004; TOV 2002. Texts will be cited according to their inventory number; for publication details cf. the inventory by TOV/PFANN 2002, 27–114.

[31] There are over 25 examples of scrolls containing more than one composition, including about 20 opisthographs but other well-known examples include 1QS–1QSa–1QSb (although uncertain) and several scrolls that contain two books of Torah. The figure of approximately 870 scrolls is based on counting the inventory numbers for each cave in DJD 39 (n. 30) and cross-checking with the inventory in the Accordance index of the Dead Sea Scrolls, adding for non-numbered scrolls and sub-divided inventory numbers (but not including the excessive subdivisions of 4Q249 and 4Q250), and subtracting for opisthographs. The figure of 930 cited by TOV 2002, 167 appears to refer to works not scrolls, and is in any case probably too high since it includes all subdivisions proposed by editors.

[32] LANGE/MITTMANN-RICHERT 2002, cf. 136–139 “Poetic and Liturgical Texts”, 143 “Curses,” “Exorcisms,” and “Magic Book”, 145–146 “Unclassified Manuscripts” that contain possible prayer or hymnic language. For names of texts and important notes on many of them, cf. this inventory; I have listed a number of texts under different categories.

There are seventeen collections of liturgical prayers or songs for calendrical occasions: a collection of blessings for days of the month (4Q503) and two copies of prayers for days of the week (4Q504, 4Q506); four copies of a collection of festival prayers (1Q34+34bis, 4Q507, 4Q508, 4Q509+505) and a further collection of liturgical prayers that are probably also for festivals (4Q502);[33] and nine copies of a collection of *Songs for the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400–407, 11Q17).[34] Two further texts are lists of songs and prayers for days of the month (4Q334) and festivals of the year (4Q409), but it is unknown whether these also included the texts of prayers. There are nineteen collections of prayers or songs for specific ritual occasions: three for purification rituals (4Q284, 4Q414, 4Q512); nine for various blessing and cursing rituals (4Q286–290, 1Q28b, 4Q275, 4Q280, 5Q14)[35]; and seven for various apotropaic hymns (4Q444, 4Q510–511, 6Q18) and exorcism incantations (4Q560, 8Q5, 11Q11).[36]

Numerous collections of religious poetry found at Qumran do not indicate specific liturgical occasions, although it is probable that they were used in prayer. This includes eight collections of thanksgiving hymns (*Hodayot*: 1QH[a], 1QH[b], 4Q427–432) and five similar texts (4Q433, 4Q433a, 4Q440, 4Q440a, 4Q471b); five collections of laments (4Q179, 4Q445, 4Q439, 4Q469, 4Q501); eleven collections of psalms (4Q380–381, 4Q392+393, 4Q434–438, 4Q88, 11Q5–6)[37]; two other scrolls with religious poetry (4Q448, 4Q215a), and 22 further prayer or poetic texts too fragmentary to determine genre. This list does not include 19 unclassified works with possible prayer or poetic content, or 33 "scriptural" Psalters.[38]

For the present purposes, we focus especially on those scrolls that were most clearly for liturgical use on the basis of rubrics and formulas, and on

---

[33] BAILLET 1982, 81 regarded 4Q502 as possibly a marriage ceremony, but this is unlikely. That it is more likely a collection of festival prayers, cf. SATLOW 1998, 57–68. The fragments labeled 4Q505 are not a third copy of Words of the Luminaries as treated by their editor (BAILLET 1982, 168), but rather belong to 4Q509; cf. FALK 1998, 59–61.

[34] A copy also turned up at Masada, but this will not be counted in the statistics here.

[35] Six of these are classified in LANGE/MITTMANN-RICHERT 2002, 137 as covenant ceremonies, but it is more likely that these belong to various blessing and cursing rituals. Two are classified in LANGE/MITTMANN-RICHERT 2002, 143 under "magic and divination." 6Q16 may also be a blessing/curse text.

[36] Cf. ESHEL 2003, 395–415. On 11Q11, see n. 121 below.

[37] The latter three are collections of psalms that mostly occur in the "biblical" Psalter, but also include a number of other psalms and with unique arrangements. Scholars continue to disagree whether these should be regarded as copies of "scriptural" Psalters or as liturgical collections of psalms.

[38] Cf. preceding note.

physical features that are most readily identifiable, especially the material and whether the scroll was inscribed on both sides, and physical measurements.

Writing Material

The choice of writing material is both readily evident and significant. Various writing surfaces were available in antiquity for different uses, including stone, clay tablets, pottery shards (ostraca), wood, metal sheets, wax tablets, papyrus, and animal skin. Scrolls of skin and papyrus were both widely used, but papyrus was by far the preferred material in Egypt and throughout the Greco-Roman world for all kinds of writing.[39] The texts found at Qumran are overwhelmingly on animal skins.[40] Apart from a few ostraca and a copper scroll, there are about 775 parchment scrolls and probably about 90 papyri (about 10% of the total).[41] Some suggest that this reflects a general preference for animal skins as the writing material of choice among Jews in Palestine in the Second Temple period for literary texts, especially for scriptural literature.[42] This would seem to be supported

---

[39] TOV 2004, 31; MILLARD 2001, 17–41. As a rough indication, in the Leuven Database of Ancient Books (www.trismegistos.org/ldab) papyrus makes up approximately 50% of books catalogued for the 2nd c. BCE, rising to about 80% for the 1st c. CE. Throughout this period, parchment constitutes less than 1% of books in the database. In Mesopotamia, parchment seems to have been more common than papyrus, but little survives; cf. FORBES 1966, 63–66; HARAN 1983, 111–122.

[40] The animal skin scrolls from Qumran are best described as parchment rather than leather since they are not tanned, although it seems they may have had some surface treatment with tannins; cf. POOLE 1962, 20–21.

[41] TOV counts 131 papyri including 10 documentary and 121 non-documentary texts (2004, 44–45). His detailed list seems to give higher figures yet: 19 documentary texts and 131 non-documentary, but the 19 documentary texts inexplicably include 9 that are not papyrus, and the non-documentary texts count each text on opisthographs separately, so one must subtract 10 to include each manuscript only once. The 10 documentary papyri include 6 that are probably not from Qumran according to the editor (YARDENI 1997, 283–284. Also, the figure of 121 non-documentary papyri is significantly inflated by counting the documents originally numbered as 4Q249 and 4Q250 as 38 separate manuscripts (4Q249, 4Q249$^{a–z}$, 4Q250, 4Q250$^{a–j}$), many represented by only 1 or 2 tiny fragments. In this, TOV follows the judgment of the editor (PFANN 2000, 515–701), but there is no material basis for the excessive subdivision. It remains possible that most or even all of the fragments belong to a single scroll inscribed on both sides – the verso only partly inscribed. Thus, a more accurate estimate is about 90 papyri, 4 of which are documentary.

[42] WISE 1994, 129. Scriptural scrolls on skin are attested in Aristeas 3.176 and Jos. Ant. 12.89. It may well be that animal skin was viewed as the proper material for

by the manuscript evidence from other sites in the Judean desert (mostly second century CE): these are predominantly documentary texts on papyrus, and the few literary texts are mostly on parchment.[43] Be that as it may, the manuscripts from Qumran are almost exclusively literary texts, with very few documentary texts. Of about 870 total manuscripts, almost 90% are on animal skin, and about 10% are on papyrus. Given the distinct preference for parchment at Qumran, the number of literary texts written on papyrus is significant. As Michael WISE has pointed out, literary texts at Qumran written on papyrus are likely personal copies.[44]

More information is to be gained from an internal comparison of the types of texts at Qumran most likely to be written on papyrus. If we ignore the large number of unidentified fragmentary papyrus texts (50+), the group of texts that have at least one papyrus copy is dominated by three categories of texts: parascriptural texts (13/104 = 12.5%), prayer texts (11/91 = 12%), and rules/religious law (7/58 = 12%).[45] The percentage of prayer and poetic texts in total on papyrus is similar to these other categories, which are just a bit higher than the overall average for papyrus among the total corpus (10.3%).

But if we subdivide the prayer texts, the picture becomes more interesting. We can isolate a group of eleven prose prayer texts that are most certainly liturgical texts for communal prayers at specific ritual occasions based on recitation rubrics – prayers for days of the month, days of the week, festivals, and for ritual purification. This group accounts for about half of the prayer texts on papyrus.

---

scriptural scrolls long before the rabbinic prescriptions (m.Meg 2:2; y.Meg 1.71d; Sof 1:1–4); cf. TOV 2004, 32–33.

[43] LANGE/MITTMANN-RICHERT 2002, 149–164. The other sites in the Judean desert with manuscript finds are Jericho, Nar, Wadi Ghuweir, Muraba'at, Sdeir, Hever/Seiyal, Mishmar, Se'elim, Masada. Only Muraba'at and Masada had any literary texts on papyri.

[44] WISE 1994, 129–130.

[45] For these averages I count compositions not scrolls since in a few cases more than one composition is on the same scroll. The papyrus texts of these categories are as follows. Parascriptural texts: 4Q127, 4Q217, 4Q223–4, 4Q382, 4Q384, 4Q391, 4Q465?, 4Q482?, 4Q483?, 4Q484?, 4Q488, 4Q489, 6Q10. Prayer/poetic texts: 4Q432, 4Q433a, 4Q499, 4Q500, 4Q502, 4Q503, 4Q506, 4Q509+505, 4Q512, 6Q16, 6Q18. Religious law/rules: 4Q249; 4Q398; 4Q255; 4Q257; 4Q273; 4Q496, 4Q497.

Table 1: *Liturgical Prose Prayers on Papyrus*

	Papyrus	Total mss
4Q503 (4Qpap Daily Prayers: prayers for days of a month)	1	1
4Q506 (4Qpap Words of Luminaries[c]; prayers for days of the week)	1	2
4Q509+505 (4Qpap Festival Prayers[c])	1	4
4Q502 (4QpapRitMar; probably festival prayers)	1	1
4Q512 (4Qpap Ritual of Purification B)	1	3
Total	5	11

Out of the remaining 80 or so prayer scrolls, there are a further six papyri. Where it is possible to tell, these are poetic.

Table 2: *Religious Poetry on Papyrus*

	Papyrus	Total mss
4Q432 (4Qpap Hodayot[f])	1	8
4Q433a (4Qpap Hodayot-like Text B)	1	5[46]
4Q499 (4Qpap Hymns/Prayers)	1	1
4Q500 (4Qpap Benedictions)	1	1
6Q16 (6Qpap Benedictions; probably blessings and curses)	1	1
6Q18 (6Qpap Hymn; probably apotropaic hymns)	1	1
Total	6	17

Besides the liturgical texts listed above, the other concentrated grouping of texts with at least one papyrus copy consists of sectarian rule books that occur in high numbers. There are two papyrus scrolls of the Community Rule (4Q255, 4Q257; of 12), two of the War Scroll and related texts (4Q496; 4Q497; of 11), and one of the Damascus Document (4Q273; of 10).[47] Considering that there are papyri copies of two other important sectarian works occurring in large numbers – the legal text MMT (4Q398; of 7) and two papyrus scrolls of Hodayot and similar hymns (4Q432 and

[46] Note: the various Hodayot-like texts are not copies of the same work; neither, for that matter, are the Hodayot manuscripts identical collections. Cf. SCHULLER 1999, 74–75.

[47] According to PFANN, there are nine papyrus copies of the Rule of the Congregation from Cave 4 written in Cryptic A script (4Qpap cryptA Serek ha-Edah[a–i]), besides the copy from Cave 1 (1QSa) attached to the Rule of the Community (1QS). Cf. PFANN 2000, 534–574. The evidence is very slender, however, based mostly on correspondence of a few partial words. Even if some of the correspondences are accepted as pointing to a copy of the same work, it is very dubious that these are nine separate copies.

4Q433a; of 13) – it does seem that liturgical texts and sectarian rules are the most likely to be copied on papyrus, and that this probably has to do with special desirability for personal copies of these two groups of texts.[48] The predilection for these genres on papyrus stands in stark contrast to the treatment of scriptural scrolls, which are almost never written on papyrus at Qumran. Of about 180 scriptural manuscripts in Hebrew, only 2–6 are on papyrus.[49]

Opisthographs

The picture becomes sharper when we consider opisthographs, that is, manuscripts with writing on both sides. These are very rare among the manuscripts found at Qumran – about 20 or less out of around 900 manuscripts – but are especially used for prayer texts. In order to assess this connection, it is necessary to clarify a number of problems that make it difficult to produce exact statistics. Some of the texts exist only in tiny pieces, and it is difficult to tell whether certain lots of fragments assigned a single reference number represent one text or rather multiple texts grouped together on the basis of writing on both sides. In some cases, there is no legible writing on the reverse side, but merely a suspicion that certain marks might be writing. This leads in some instances to false identifications, such as when supposed writing turns out to be transfer from the face of an adjacent layer.[50] It is likely that some opisthographs have not been identified because the writing has completely faded, and the backs of manuscripts were not routinely photographed unless writing was apparent on them.

---

[48] Cf. also TOV 2004, 51. Prayer texts are also the most common genre among compositions surviving only on papyrus, ibid, 50–51.

[49] 4QpapIsa[p] (4Q76); 4QpapGen[o] or 4QpapJub[j] (4Q483); 6QpapDeut? (6Q3); 6QpapKgs (6Q4); 6QpapPs? (6Q5); 6QpapDan (6Q7). Cf. TOV 2002, 165–183; TOV 2004, 51. The cave 4 copies are so fragmentary that it is not possible to be certain that they are complete biblical scrolls rather than quotations in another genre. The majority are from cave 6, and two of these are also uncertain. It should be noted that cave 6 is special in that the majority of scrolls were papyrus: 21 of 31 total: TOV 2004, 47. In contrast to the low ratio for Hebrew scriptures, 3 of 4 scriptural manuscripts in Greek from Qumran are papyri (4Q120; 7Q1; 7Q2; Tov 2002, 165).

[50] E.g., 4Q250 (4Qpap cryptic A Text Concerning Cultic Service A; semi-formal, ca. 100–75 BCE) is listed in PFANN 2000, 678–9 as inscribed on the verso (PAM 43.413). The recto looks blank, but there are possible traces of a few letters at about the right intervals for the line spacing (PAM 43.414, not published). Each instance is dubious, and it is possible that these are the remains of ink transfer.

The analysis below is based on fresh examination of the photographs and editions. My list of opisthographs summarized in the following tables differs somewhat from those in three previous studies of opisthographs found at Qumran by Michael WISE, Emanuel TOV, and George BROOKE.[51]

For the purposes of this study, I will not include the following cases of manuscripts inscribed on both sides. First, the writing of signatures or titles on the reverse, whose purpose is to be visible on the outside of the closed scroll, is not relevant to the present study.[52] Second, a number of the *tefillin* found at Qumran are inscribed on both sides, but since these are not intended to be read as texts but are sealed up to be worn as amulets they represent a different phenomenon and will be treated separately as a special case. They will not be included in the statistics on opisthographs.

In the charts below, I use the terms recto (r) and verso (v) in a non-technical manner for convenience to refer to the side first inscribed and the reverse side respectively. Usually, but not always, the recto of a papyrus is the side with fibers running horizontally, and with parchment, the side that had hair. In some cases, it is not possible to tell which side was inscribed first, nor which side of a papyrus fragment has horizontal fibers. The text on the reverse side (rev) may be in three different orientations:

---

[51] WISE examined 16 opisthographs: WISE 1994, 130–137. Three of these are false identifications (4Q429/4Q250; 4Q259/4Q319; 4Q377), one is probably false (4Q520), and two are possibly the same manuscript (1Q70). TOV 2004, 295–297 lists 21 opisthographs found at Qumran, and 14 from other sites in the Judean desert. Of the 21 from Qumran, one is an accidental repeat (4Q509+4Q505/4Q496, 4Q506), another is blank on the verso (4Q342), and eight are items from fragments labeled 4Q250 that the editor distinguished as separate documents. Of these latter eight, six either have no writing on the reverse or only "possible" traces of ink (4Q250a,b,g,h,i,j): these should not be included. (These were included in TOV's list presumably only on the basis that the official edition of PFANN 2000 listed photograph numbers for the verso of these fragments, although they were not published. Most are blank, and the possible ink traces are questionable.) The remaining two (4Q250c/250d; 4Q250e/4Q250f) consist of two tiny fragments each, with similar script on both sides. With a combined total of 9 letters visible on recto and verso, with similar script, there is absolutely no basis for regarding these as different works: 4Q250c–f should by default be regarded as a single manuscript: contra PFANN 2000, 683,4,6–7. BROOKE 2011, in a detailed study of opisthographs from Qumran accepts 19 opisthographs from TOV's list (minus 4Q342 and the doublet) and adds 16 *tefillin*, arguing that these should be counted as well.

[52] Cf. TOV 2004, 70, 120–121. For Qumran, out of 51 scrolls with the beginnings preserved at least in part, TOV lists one instance of signatures (4Q345 Deed A ar or heb) and five instances of titles (4Q249 papcryptA Midrash Sefer Moshe; 4Q504 DibHam[a]; 1QS; 4Q8c Gen[h–title]; 4Q257 papS[c]).

upside-down with respect to the recto (vertical flip = v), the same way up (horizontal flip = h), or perpendicular to the text on the recto (p).[53]

The majority of opisthographs found at Qumran are on papyrus. Four of these have identifiable content (Table 3). Some further opisthographs on papyrus survive only on small fragments with unidentifiable content, making a reliable count impossible (Table 4).

Table 3: *Papyrus Opisthographs*

		Name of Text	Rev	Script	Date
r	4Q255	pap Serek ha-Yahad[a]		Early Hasm. cursive	125–100 BCE
v	4Q433a	pap Hodayot-like Text B	v	Hasm. semi-formal	c. 75 BCE
r	4Q499	pap Hymns/Prayers		Hasm. semi-formal	c. 75 BCE
v	4Q497	pap War Scroll-like Text A	h	Hasm. semi-formal (different hand?)	c. 50 BCE
r	4Q503	pap Daily Prayers		Hasm. semi-formal	100–75 BCE
v	4Q512	pap Ritual Purification B	h	Hasm. semi-formal (different hand)	100–75 BCE
r	4Q509 + 505	pap Festival Prayers		late Hasm. semi-formal	c. 70–60 BCE
v	4Q496	pap Milhamah[f]	v	late Hasm. semi-formal	after 50 BCE
	4Q506	pap Words of the Luminariesc		late Herodian semi-formal	mid-1st c. CE

[53] For publication details of the official editions of these texts, cf. TOV/PFANN 2002, 27–114. Descriptions of script and paleographic dating are adapted from the official editions where available; cf. editions in DJD, and the summary compiled by WEBSTER 2002, 351–446.

Table 4: *Unidentified Papyrus Opisthographs*

		Name of Text	Rev	Script	Date
r	1Q70 1–10[54]	pap Unclassified		calligraphic	not dated
v	1Q70 1–10v	pap Unclassified (different hand/work)	v	cursive	not dated
r	4Q250c,e	pap cryptic Unidentified Text I, K		cryptic A semi-formal	2nd c. BCE[55]
v	4Q250d,f	pap cryptic Unidentified Text J, L	h	same?	2nd c. BCE
r	4Q518 1–20	pap Unclassified frgs		2+ different hands?	not dated
v	4Q519	pap Unclassified frgs	h	different hand	not dated
r	4Q518 21–62	pap Unclassified frgs		3+ different hands?	not dated
v	4Q519	pap Unclassified frgs	v	different hand	not dated
r	4Q518 63–68	pap Unclassified frgs		indeterminate	not dated
v	4Q519	pap Unclassified frgs	p	indeterminate	not dated

These must represent at least five different manuscripts, but more likely ten, with a couple more possible.[56] Another six opisthographs are on parchment.

---

[54] Publication: BARTHÉLEMY/MILIK 1955, 148–149, 155. Milik regards ff. 1–6 and 7–10 of 1Q70 as belonging to different documents (a and b), although this seems difficult to determine from the very tiny remains. Wise 1994, 133 lists these as separate documents; Tov 2004, 295 lists as one document.

[55] The dating and script description of the 4Q250 fragments is from PFANN 2000, 683, 684, 686, 687. It is important to note, however, that there are only 4 tiny fragments, and only 9 letters visible on recto and verso combined: this is not at all sufficient for a paleographical comparison.

[56] The fragments assigned to 4Q518/4Q519 must represent at least three different manuscripts on the basis that three different orientations are attested for the writing on the verso; there are also at least three different hands, but possibly more. The fragments

Table 5: *Parchment Opisthographs*

		Name of Text	Rev	Script	Date
r	4Q201	Enoch[a] ar col. I–III		Hasmonean semi-formal	200–150 BCE[57]
v	4Q338[58]	Genealogical List?	v	different hand	ca. 1 c. later
r	4Q324	Mishmarot C (register of priestly courses)		Late Hasmonean or early Herodian bookhand	50–25 BCE
v	4Q355	Account C ar or heb	v	cursive	not dated
r	4Q343	Letter nab		Early Nabatean	mid-1st c. BCE
v	4Q343	Letter nab	p[59]	same hand	
r	4Q415	Instruction[a]		early formal Herodian	30–1 BCE
v	4Q414	Ritual of Purification A	v	(late) Herodian different hand (thick lines)	30 BCE–68 CE
r	4Q460 9	Narrative Work and Prayer		Semi-formal	late Hasm. or early Herod. (75–1 BCE)
v	4Q350	Account gr	v[60]		late 1st c. CE?
r	4Q504	Words of the Luminaries		Hasmonean semi-formal	mid-2nd c. BCE
v		Title; continuation	p h	-different hand -same hand	

Of these, two should be bracketed as probably irrelevant. 4Q343 is a letter written in an early Nabatean script, on both sides of a single sheet of parchment. It belongs to a small group of documentary texts that were purchased from dealers who claimed that they came from Qumran cave 4,

grouped under the numbers 1Q70 and 4Q250 may also represent several different hands, although this is uncertain.

[57] MILIK 1976, 140.

[58] Publication: TOV 2000, 290, pl. XIX; PAM 42.078. TOV notes that "[t]he text was written on the *v* of 4QEn[a] (4Q201) cols. I–III, the *v* of the remaining columns of that composition (cols. V–VI) being empty," and that the content could be related to Enoch, e.g., a genealogical list of patriarchs. MILIK suggested that the text represented a "schoolboy's exercise."

[59] BROOKE 2011, 8 incorrectly lists the verso as upside-down in relation to the recto.

[60] TOV 2004, 70 incorrectly lists 4Q350 as perpendicular to 4Q460 on the recto.

but likely were not from Qumran.[61] Another manuscript has a Narrative Work and Prayer (4Q460) on the front side, written in Hebrew in the first century BCE; about a century later, someone scribbled a list of accounts in Greek (4Q350) on a piece torn from this scroll (frg. 9). This profane treatment of a prayer containing the Tetragrammaton is unlikely to be by a Jew – let alone one from the same movement. The editor suggests that it is likely evidence of Roman inhabitants of Qumran in the late first century CE.[62] If so, this cannot be included among Jewish opisthographs from Qumran. Also, it is not evidence for the reuse of a scroll, but for the use of a scrap from a scroll. These two scrolls will be excluded from the statistics below, but included in the numbers in parentheses.

Thus, we count 9–14 papyrus opisthographs, and 4 on parchment. Several observations are immediately apparent. First, papyri are much more commonly used for opisthographs than parchment manuscripts. This may have to do primarily with the characteristics of the material: the flesh side of the type of parchment found at Qumran is not as suitable for inscribing. The relative cost of the materials could also be a factor. Second, there is an unusually high ratio of literary texts. In other contexts, opisthographs are almost exclusively documentary texts. Opisthographs point to personal copies, and so we have to reckon with an unusual need for personal copies of literary texts at Qumran.[63] But more importantly, the most common works on opisthographs from Qumran are prayer texts. Of 17 (19) different works of which at least the genre may be identified, 9 (10) are prayer texts, 4 are other types of literary works, 1 is a register of priestly courses, and 2 (4) are documentary texts. From another perspective, all 4 of the papyrus opisthographs with identifiable content, and 2 (3) of the parchment opisthographs, contain prayers. Of course, the 5–10 unclassified opisthographs would possibly change these ratios somewhat, but the predominance of prayers is striking.

In order to fully appreciate the significance of these observations, it is necessary to make several further distinctions. First, it is the writing on the reverse that makes the manuscript an opisthograph, and hence is the most significant for our purposes. Apart from 4Q460 – which is probably irelevant anyway – all six of the opisthographs containing prayers have prayer texts on the verso. Secondly, we must distinguish between manuscripts

---

[61] Cf. YARDENI 1997, 283; for edition of 4Q343, cf. pp. 286–288; Fig. 28 and pl. LV.

[62] COTTON 2000. On 4Q460, cf. LARSON 2000.

[63] WISE 1994, 130 states that opisthographs on papyrus are "virtually certain indicators of private copies."

where a single work extends onto the reverse side ("continuous" texts) and manuscripts that are re-used by adding a second work (or more) on the reverse side. Third, with regard to reuse of manuscripts, it is necessary to distinguish between instances where the reuse signifies that the original text is defunct, and where it is a case of creating a collection of valued works.

Apart from the *tefillin*, which will be considered separately below, there are the following cases of continuous opisthographs. 4Q504 is a collection of daily prayers for days of the week written on a parchment scroll around the middle of the second century BCE.[64] The scribe ran out of room on the front of the parchment in the middle of the prayer for Sabbath, and finished it on the reverse side (at least 2 columns), with the text the same way up. To have to turn a scroll around to read from the opposite side would be awkward and certainly less than ideal. Thus, the use of a scroll too small for the content points to either poor estimation or the valuing of thrift over quality. Another indication of the latter is that no blank space was left at the beginning of the scroll as a handling sheet: the title was inscribed – perpendicular to the text – on the reverse of the first column of text. These features are clear marks that it is a personal copy, not a professional product.

The letter 4Q343 is also a continuous opisthograph, with the letter continuing on the verso at right angles to the recto. As noted above this is probably not from Qumran. It should be noted that perpendicular writing on the verso is typical of papyri so that the writing can run along the fibers. The practice on a parchment is probably derived from documentary texts normally written on papyrus.

4Q250c–f may be another example of a continuous opisthograph, but the four fragments are too small to determine if it is the same hand on the recto and verso.

There are three cases where the writing on the reverse probably reflects the recycling of a defunct manuscript. The clearest case is 4Q460/4Q350, where the Greek account on the verso shows disrespect for the prayer on the recto, but as noted above, this is probably irrelevant for our study. Two cases are relevant. Account C (4Q355) – perhaps in Aramaic – was written in cursive script on the verso of a register of priestly courses (4Q324) written in Hebrew. An Aramaic copy of Enoch (4Q201) from the first half of the second century BCE was reused about a century later for writing some type of list – perhaps genealogical – on the reverse (4Q338). In each

[64] Publication: BAILLET 1982, 137–168.

case, the text on the verso is a different genre, written by a different hand, and a considerable time later.

There are at least five cases, however, where the writing on the verso reflects not a rejection of the text on the front, but probably the intent to create a collection of valued writings. The genres on the recto and verso are similar or at least compatible, and the dates of copying tend to be closer. All of them involve prayers, including all four of the papyri with identifiable content. The clearest example is 4Q503/4Q512.[65] On the recto of this papyrus is the only surviving copy of Daily Prayers, a collection of morning and evening liturgical prayers for days of a month. On the verso, copied the same way up, is Ritual of Purification B, which contains instructions and prayers for purification rituals. These two liturgical texts share affinities for similar patterns of blessings: a statement of occasion, instructions for prayer, and the same opening blessing formula. Thus, "On the fif[teenth of the month in the eve]ning they will bless. [They] will recite and say Blessed be the Go[d of Israel] who…" (4Q503 1–3 6–7); "And on the third day […and he will ble]ss. He will recite and sa[y Blessed be yo]u God of Israel…" (4Q512 1–6 1–2). They also share similar scribal features. Neither is ruled, and they have uneven letter size, line spacing, column width, and left margin. They show a similar full orthography, and both make similar use of the hook-style *paragraphos* marker.[66] The hands are of the same style (the editor calls it "calligraphie asmonéenne," this type of hand is often called "Hasmonean semi-formal") and are both dated to the same time period (100–75 BCE), although 4Q512 was probably copied shortly afterwards by a different individual (the letter size and thickness, line spacing, and margins are all a bit larger on 4Q512, which also has less neatly formed letters).[67] Although the fragmentary nature of the scroll makes it impossible to reconstruct even a single column, it is possible to gain a reasonably accurate sense of the size of the whole based on the calculation that 4Q503 is highly formulaic: there are 60 prayers (2 for each day of a month) of typically 6 lines each, totaling

---

[65] Publication: BAILLET 1982, 105–136 and 262–286.

[66] Cf. TOV 2004, 52, 182–3, 343.

[67] The letter size averages 3 mm on 4Q503 and 4 mm on 4Q512; the interval between lines averages 5 mm on 4Q503 and 7 mm on 4Q512. The top margin on frg. 9 is 8 mm on 4Q503 and 20 mm on 4Q512 (cf. frg. 10); the bottom margin on frg. 4 is 14 mm on 4Q503 and 22 mm on 4Q512. The different margin size may explain the fact that there are some fragments inscribed on the recto and blank on the verso (215–221) and other fragments inscribed on the verso and blank on the recto (226–232). On the hand, cf. BAILLET 1982, 105, 262; SCHULLER 1999, 238.

about 360 lines. Based on other considerations, the columns are probably about 22 lines high, yielding a scroll of roughly 15 cm high and 2.5 m long, with 16 columns.[68] This has the appearance of a portable personal collection of similar prayers.

Another papyrus scroll has a copy of Festival Prayers (4Q509+505) on the recto, and on the verso has a copy (or excerpt) of the War Scroll (4Q496) copied in a similar style script (late Hasmonean semi-formal) a few years later (both dated paleographically around the second quarter of the 1st c. BCE).[69] The verso is oriented upside down with relation to the recto so that the beginning of each text would be at the same end of the scroll. About a century later, someone added to the verso a copy of prayers for days of the week known as Words of the Luminaries (4Q506). The scroll is much too fragmentary to make any determinations of size or layout of the scroll, but it seems to be the case that the texts on the verso did not fill up the scroll (frgs 183–313 are blank on the verso). All three texts are written with a full orthography, and at least the first two use the hook-style *paragraphos* as a marginal marking.[70] What is especially intriguing about this scroll is that the prayers on both sides are form-critically of the same type, with a statement of occasion ("Prayer for the festival of *n*."; "Prayer for the *n* day"), opening with the prayer formula "Remember, O Lord…," and concluding with the benediction form "Blessed be the Lord who…"[71] It is by no means accidental that these two collections of prayers with the same form for different occasions end up on front and back of the same scroll: they constitute an intentional collection in a personal scroll. This could suggest that the War Scroll – sandwiched between these two – was used as a liturgical text in some way.

A third papyrus scroll also contains prayers on recto (4Q499 Hymns/Prayers) and verso (4Q497 War Scroll-like Text A), although the scroll is much too fragmentary to determine the character of the prayers on

---

[68] The 12th prayer (morning on 6th day) begins at the bottom of a column (frg. 4 line 12). The 66 lines of the preceding 11 prayers most probably divide into 3 columns of about 22 lines each. Two columns of 33 lines do not allow correspondence between the content on the verso. Columns of 16 lines are the smallest possible (cf. frgs. 2–3), but this would yield a column almost twice as wide as high, which seems unlikely but not impossible, cf. 14 cm line length reconstructed for frgs. 1–3; FALK 1998 pl. III.

[69] The editor, BAILLET 1982, 184, describes the hand of 4Q509 as "Calligraphie de la fin de la période asmonéenne, environ 70–60 avant J.-C.".

[70] For the *paragraphos* sign cf. 4Q509 frgs 49, 225, 265, and 10ii–11 8; and 4Q496 10 2. Cf. TOV 2004, 52, 343.

[71] FALK 1998, 79, 183.

either side, or anything about size or layout.[72] The verso was copied by a different hand but in a very similar script style, shortly after the recto, around the middle of the 1st c. BCE.[73]

The fourth example, on "rather coarse" papyrus, was originally inscribed with the earliest surviving copy of Serek ha-Yahad (4Q255) in a "crude, early cursive" hand of the Hasmonean period, dated to around the last quarter of the 2nd c. BCE.[74] The cursive script, the use of coarse papyrus, frequent lack of space between words, and lines of writing which are not straight, evenly spaced, or parallel to the fibers all suggest that this was a personal copy. The four surviving fragments do not allow one to estimate the size of the scroll, other than that it must have been at least 11.8 cm in height, with columns of at least 9 lines and generous top and bottom margins of approximately 2.3 cm; if no larger than this, it would have been a small format scroll.[75] Two fragments correspond to 1QS 1:1–5 and 3:7–12, that is, the opening and concluding lines of the first part of 1QS that describes the responsibilities of the Instructor (*Maskil*) of the Yahad and the annual covenant ceremony. The other two fragments do not correspond with any passages in 1QS, but one contains language similar to the discourse on the Two Spirits in 1QS 3:14–4:26. A generation or two later, someone added on the verso some hymnic and instructional material (4Q433a Hodayot-like Text B), in a Hasmonean semi-formal hand very similar to that of some of the papyrus collections just discussed (cf. 4Q503/4Q512; 4Q509), dated around 75 BCE.[76] The reverse side is up-side-down with respect to the first side, so that both texts begin at the same end. Both the script and layout are much more carefully executed than the copy of 4QS[a]: the lines are straighter and more generously and regularly

---

[72] Although few whole words survive, use of the second person singular (4Q497 2; 4Q499 7 and 48) suggests that both sides contain prayer or hymnic material. BAILLET associated the verso with the War Scroll on the basis of a few letter/word sequences otherwise only attested in 1QM, but these are far from determinative. Cf. BAILLET 1982, 69–72, 74–77.

[73] Both are Hasmonean semi-formal hands, similar to that in 4Q509. BAILLET 1982 69, 74 dates the recto c. 75 BCE, and the verso shortly afterwards, perhaps c. 50 BCE.

[74] ALEXANDER/VERMES 1998, 27–38.

[75] Cf. TOV 2004, 82–85. ALEXANDER/VERMES 1998, 28 suggest that it was a medium-large size scroll, although there is no evidence for this other than generous margins.

[76] There has been some confusion over which side is the recto: ALEXANDER/VERMES 1998, 5 and 28 treat 4QpapS[a] as the recto, but MILIK had regarded this as the verso (in the Preliminary Concordance). It is sometimes difficult to determine, but in any case, according to the paleographic dates, 4QpapS[a] was written first, and the other text added to the opposite side up to fifty or so years later. Cf. SCHULLER 1999, 238.

spaced, and words are not cramped. The compositions on both sides are associated with the *Maskil*, the authoritative instructor and liturgical master of the community (4Q433a 2 2; 4Q255 1 1 [restored]).[77] It is difficult to imagine that the person who copied the second side would not equally value the account of the contents on the first side. Hence, this scroll almost certainly represents a personal collection of some liturgical and instructional materials associated with the figure of the *Maskil*.

The fifth case is a parchment scroll originally inscribed with a copy of Instruction[a] (4Q415), in an early Herodian formal hand dated to approximately the last third of the first century BCE.[78] This is one of eight copies of a wisdom text that was clearly much valued at Qumran even though it was not composed there. The script is very neat, and the scroll carefully and skillfully prepared. Some time later, someone else inscribed on the "poorly prepared" reverse side a copy of Ritual of Purification A (4Q414), upside-down in relation to the recto and in a very different Herodian hand that is much less skilled and more difficult to date (30 BCE–68 CE).[79] Both sides were written with a full orthography.[80] Noting that 4Q415 is fairly well preserved, STRUGNELL and HARRINGTON comment that it is unclear why the scroll was rejected and re-used.[81]

Although they are different genres and there is no apparent association between the two texts, I would suggest that here too it is not a case of a rejection of the original text but more likely the owner added another text on the reverse of a scroll he owned and still valued. This is suggested by two considerations: Instruction was still in currency, being copied and valued at Qumran throughout the Herodian period, and 4Q415 on the recto was in excellent condition and still survives in significantly better condition than 4Q414 on the verso.[82] In any case, the Ritual of Purification copy on the verso is clearly a personal copy and the scroll seems likely to have been a compact size: the minimum size for the scroll would be about

---

[77] Cf. ALEXANDER/VERMES 1998, 32; SCHULLER 1999, 242.

[78] STRUGNELL/HARRINGTON 1999, 41.

[79] ESHEL 1999, 135. Note that the publications of 4Q414 and 4Q415 in DJD use different numbers for the same fragments.

[80] TOV 2004, 72, 342.

[81] STRUGNELL/HARRINGTON 1999, 41.

[82] Although it is a much older wisdom text, all eight copies date to the Herodian period, and two to the mid-late Herodian period (1Q26, 4Q423). Cf. STRUGNELL/HARRINGTON 1999, 36, 42, 76, 146–147, 217, 476, 501, 505, 535.

12.5 cm tall including 13 lines and generous top and bottom margins of 1.8 cm.[83]

It should be noted that 4Q414 is one of three copies of a liturgical text with rituals and prayers for individuals undergoing purification: besides 4Q414 and 4Q512 described above, is a parchment manuscript, 4Q284 Purification Liturgy, in a neat late Herodian hand.[84] They seem to be closely related versions, but are too fragmentary for thorough comparisons. Two are clearly personal copies written on the verso of an opisthograph: 4Q512 on the verso of a papyrus scroll containing another prayer text (4Q503), and 4Q414 on the verso of a parchment scroll with a wisdom text. The dates range from early first century BCE (4Q512) to first century CE (4Q414, 4Q284). They all share the same prayer form with the Daily Prayers of 4Q503, and 4Q414 and 4Q512 also share with 4Q503 a similar use of the hook-style *paragraphos* marker. These features point to a common setting for the copying and use of these texts, but yet, not specifically that of the professional market. Of the three purification ritual texts, only the nicely produced 4Q284 could be a commercial copy. It is not difficult to imagine that in a community where ritual purification was of heightened importance – where there were more occasions requiring purification, and rituals requiring prayers of the individual – there would be a need for personal copies.[85]

In short, prayer texts were significantly more prone to be written on papyrus and/or as an opisthograph than any other genre at Qumran. We can refine these observations further in conjunction with consideration of scroll measurements, but there is another category of texts that may represent reuse that should be mentioned first.

---

[83] This estimate is based on measurements of fragments 7 and 13, the probability based on shape that these two fragments were in adjacent layers with the top line visible in fragment 7 at the height of the second line in fragment 13, and assuming that the bottom of fragment 7 is near the bottom of the column, with a bottom margin about the same size as the top margin.

[84] BAUMGARTEN 1999, 123–129.

[85] These purification rituals agree with the Temple Scroll in requiring immersions on the first, third, and seventh day of the purification process (cf. 11QT[a] 49:17–21), in contrast to Pharisaic practice that required immersion only on the seventh day, cf. ESHEL 1999, 136–139. These texts prescribe specific prayers for the individual to recite in different purification situations, which is otherwise not attested in ancient Jewish sources.

Other Possible Examples of Reuse

There are other texts that, although they are not technically opisthographs, may be relevant to the phenomenon of reuse of a scroll and the creation of a personal collection of prayer texts. There is too much uncertainty about the nature of these texts, however, to integrate them in the statistics, and I describe here briefly two examples. 4Q448 Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer is a peculiar scroll with an unusual layout.[86] All that survives is the right side of the first sheet of a large format scroll (17.8+ cm high, top margin 21 mm, bottom margin 18+ mm). There was no separate handling sheet, but a wide right margin (45–50 mm) including the fastening tab. In the top half of the sheet, is a short psalm of nine lines, with a title ("Hallelujah. A Psal[m], a song of […]") that begins in the margin. In the bottom half, is a prose prayer in two columns of nine lines each. The first is very narrow (2.6 cm wide) and is written in the wide margin. These columns in the bottom half are not aligned with the psalm in the top half, and are written in a different hand, and were probably added later. The lines are not straight or evenly spaced (c. 9 mm on top, c. 7 mm on bottom), with very uneven letter size (4–5 mm). "All three columns were written in a careless hand; the script in the lower columns is a little more cursive than that in the upper column."[87] The whole gives the impression of a poorly executed personal copy, written perhaps on a single sheet intended for a different scroll, and reused for the addition of another prayer with thematic association.

4Q392 and 4Q393 belong to a single scroll of two sheets sewn together. Different scribes inscribed the two sheets, however: there is a different hand, different letter size and line spacing (3 mm and 6–8.5 mm; 2 mm and 6 mm) and different bottom margin (9 mm higher on the second sheet). It is likely that these are two separate works – a psalm contrasting God's greatness with human frailty, similar in style to the Hodayot, and a psalm based on the prayer of Moses. It is possible that the second sheet was added later, and shows the development of a collection of psalms by supplementation. Although it is impossible to tell the height of the scroll since the top margin is missing, on the basis of the surviving fragments, this could be a miniature scroll a bit taller than 8.5 cm with 11+ lines.

---

[86] ESHEL/ESHEL/YARDENI 1998, 403–425, pl. XXII; ESHEL/ESHEL 2000, 645–659.
[87] ESHEL/ESHEL/YARDENI 1998, 405.

Scroll Dimensions

The physical dimensions of scrolls vary widely, from very large to miniature scrolls. To a large degree, the overall size is related to the extent of the scroll's content,[88] but the scribe may also choose larger or smaller script size, line spacing, and margins to fit the same amount of content to very different sized formats. It is particularly the choice to make a scroll as compact as possible or as luxurious as possible that is important for the present purposes. Are there any apparent tendencies among prayer scrolls? In order to compensate somewhat for the fragmentary nature of the data, I will consider the prayer scrolls in three groupings – liturgical collections of prose prayers, collections of religious poetry with sectarian language, and apotropaic or exorcistic prayers and poetry – and compare these to two groups that each has multiple copies of the same work: rule books and scriptural texts. To get a sense of proportion, I will start with the latter, and will focus on those measurements that are most readily accessible and most significant for the character of the scroll: the height of the scroll; the number of lines, the letter height, and line spacing; and the size of top and bottom margins.

Scriptural books constitute by far the majority of the largest scrolls found at Qumran, and especially those that have the character of *de luxe* scrolls.[89] To some degree, scriptural scrolls count as liturgical texts in that they may be read liturgically in the context of worship, and revered as symbolic objects. Nevertheless, it is difficult to assess this liturgical use, and how specifically it determined distinctive features of these scrolls. For this reason, they will be treated separately. Of the various possible criteria of quality and luxury, I regard the following most useful when comparing fragmentary scrolls: generous proportions of blank space to writing (large top and bottom margins in relation to column size, and a large space between lines in relation to the size of letters), evenly-spaced and straight lines of writing, and a careful book-hand.[90] Examples of large *de luxe*

---

[88] TOV 2004, 78.

[89] TOV 2004, 84–90, 125–9.

[90] This is based on the discussion by TOV 2004, 125–29, but differs somewhat from how TOV prioritizes criteria: he does not emphasize letter height and line spacing, but prioritizes margin size as the main indicator of luxury and the number of lines as the main indicator of size. These are both potentially misleading since it places 4QShirShabb[d] in the category of largest scrolls on the basis that it has 50 lines, even though it is half the height of other scrolls with a similar number of lines crammed closely together (ibid., 89, 129), and TOV categorizes 4QpapRitPur B (4Q512) as a *de*

copies of scriptural books include the following. 4QGen^{b} has 40 lines per column with very neat and even lines measuring 2 mm with generous line spacing of 7 mm and a top margin of 33 mm; the total height is approximately 35 cm. 4QExod^{c} has very similar proportions, but slightly larger yet: 38 cm tall with c. 43 lines.[91] 4QJer^{c} has an even more dramatic proportion of space to writing: an average letter height of 2.5–3 mm, but a very large line spacing of up to 14 mm (and a bottom margin of 41 mm); thus, although it has only 18 lines per column, it is a large format scroll (at least 26 cm high) and a very generous layout.[92] If the blank space between lines is less than the height of the line of writing, the column has a cramped appearance, and this is very rare among scriptural scrolls, which more typically have a line spacing (measured between the tops of lines) that is 2–3 times the height of letters, or even more. There are only a few examples of scriptural scrolls with very narrow line spacing, for example 4QIsa^{o}, which has a letter height of c. 3 mm and only c. 5 mm line spacing (i.e., 2 mm blank space between lines), and it also unusually allows "only c. 5 mm between the stitching and the beginning of letters."[93]

Of special importance to this investigation are small format scriptural scrolls.

---

luxe scroll on the basis of large margin size (ibid., 127) when it is a poorly executed copy on the back of another work. He also emphasizes a low rate of correction as an indicator of a *de luxe* scroll, but this cannot be reliably measured in very fragmentary texts.

[91] On these, cf. DAVILA 1994, 31–38, pl. VI–VIII and SANDERSON 1994, 97–125, pl. XVI–XX.

[92] The scroll would be an estimated 16.3–17.6 m long. Cf. TOV 1997, 180.

[93] TOV 2004, 135; cf. SKEHAN/ULRICH 1997, 135–7.

Table 6: *Small Format Scriptural Scrolls*[94]

	Scroll	Columns	Margins (mm)		Lines (mm)	
	Ht (cm)	# Lines	Top	Bottom	Spacing	Ltr Ht
Short Books						
2QRuth[a]	7.4+	8	15	7+	~6.8	3
4QCant[a]	9.3	14	13	15	~4.8	~1.5
4QCant[b]	9.9	14, 15	7	10	6–6.5	2–2.5
4QQoh[a]	15.7*	20	16	8	6–8	~3
4QLam	11.8	10, 11	16	22	6–7	~3
5QLam[a]	6.2	7	10	10	~6–7	3
6QCant	7.8	7	14	14	~7.5	4
Excerpted Texts						
4QDeut[j]	12.5*	14	15–17	14–15	6–7	3
4QDeut[k1]	—	13+	—	31	~6	3
4QDeut[n]	7.1	12	9, ~7	6–10	~4.7	1.5–2
4QDeut[q]	11.4	11	7+	28–29	7–9	3
5QDeut	12.3+*	15	11+	—	7	~2.5–3
4QExod[e]	8.2	8	15	12	7–9	~3
4QPs[g]	8.4	8	19	14	6–8	3

About half of these are copies of the short books among the Writings (Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, and Qohelet), which are all in small format scrolls (as small as 6.2 cm high). This is suitable to their limited content, but it is also likely that their small size is related to public liturgical reading at festivals, and hence the desirability for portable copies.[95]

---

[94] In the tables, "+" indicates a minimum value; "*" indicates an estimate based on reconstruction; "~" indicates approximate or average values; "?" indicates that there is some uncertainty about the reconstruction of fragments. A number in parentheses indicates an average. Bottom margins are measured as the blank space below (not including) the last line of writing in a column (this figure will differ from editors who measure margins from the bottom ruling). Line spacing is measured between the tops of rows of writing. Letter height is a measure of average-sized characters. Where available, I use the measurements reported by the editors in the official editions, and otherwise my own measurements from archive photographs of the Dead Sea Scrolls housed at the Leopold Muller Memorial Library at the Oxford Center for Hebrew and Jewish Studies and/or published photographs.

[95] TOV 2004, 90. These books – along with Esther, not attested at Qumran – are known in the later synagogue liturgy as the Five Megillot: they were written on

The other small scrolls are mostly much too small to have contained a whole book, and probably were limited to selected excerpts of scripture. As various scholars have noted, it is likely that these were mostly for liturgical purposes, such as the combination of the Grace at Meals, Decalogue and Shema in 4QDeut^{j} and 4QDeut^{n}, the Song of Moses in 4QDeut^{q}, an excerpt related to Passover in 4QExod^{e},[96] and small selections of Psalms (e.g., 4QPs^{g}).[97] It will suffice to describe a few examples.

4QDeut^{n} is a miniature scroll measuring 7.1 cm high. The surviving part consists of two sheets of parchment prepared somewhat differently. Unusually, the first is a small sheet containing only a single, wide column. It was ruled for fifteen lines with tiny margins, but the column is inscribed on only seven lines with the passage Deut 8:5–10. The writing starts on the second line – apparently to allow a larger top margin (10 mm) – and the remainder of the column below the passage is left blank. It would appear that this passage was deliberately presented separately. The following sheet has 5 columns inscribed with Deut 5:1–6:1+. This sheet was ruled for fourteen lines, but the columns are inscribed with only twelve lines each – apparently to allow larger bottom margins (6–10 mm). In general, the scribe paid little regard to the rulings. A sewn join visible on the right side of the first sheet indicates that there was a preceding sheet, which may have been a handling sheet. The writing is small (1.5–2 mm) but clear, and the line spacing proportionate but uneven (avg. 4.7 mm). The second sheet has a number of bad patches that the scribe left blank, and the use of two

---

individual scrolls for reading at festivals. Apart from Esther mentioned in the Mishnah (mMeg.), the textual evidence for the liturgical reading of these scrolls is post-talmudic.

[96] This contains Exod 13:3–5 on a fragment that preserves the entire height of part of one column of a miniature scroll, 8.2 cm high, written in early Hasmonean semi-cursive script. 4QExod^{d} preserves Exod 13:15–16 followed immediately by 15:1; this was probably a miniature scroll as well, but not enough survives in order to determine column size. Both were probably excerpted texts related to Passover for liturgical purposes. Cf. J. SANDERSON 1994, 127–128, 129–131.

[97] TOV 2012, 27–41, esp. 29–30, 32–34, 38–40. Also cf. Tov 2004, 90; PFANN/KISTER 1997, 7. SANDERSON 1994, 130 notes that 4QExod^{e} contained the instructions for the feast of Unleavened Bread and suggests that this may have been "a manuscript for liturgical purposes consisting of selections from the Torah." 4QGen^{d} (10.8 cm high, 11 lines) could not have contained all of Genesis (TOV 2004, 98). BROOKE 2012 calculates that it could not have contained much more than the first four or five chapters of Genesis. Similarly, 4QGen^{f} (13.5 cm high, 17 lines) could not have contained all of Genesis. In both manuscripts, the scribe shows little concern with saving space, allowing generous line spacing up to 9 and 10 mm. Cf. DAVILA 1994, 43–45, 53–55. The purpose of these excerpted texts is unclear.

mismatched sheets that were originally prepared for a different purpose suggests that this scroll makes use of "seconds." Given that these two passages are presented discretely rather than as running text, and that they are the basis of the Grace after Meals, and the Decalogue and Shema respectively, it is probable that this is a portable personal scroll of liturgical texts (it is not known what other texts might have been included in this scroll, but it was likely similar to 4QDeut^{j}).[98]

4QDeut^{j} also seems to be a small format scroll containing a collection of scriptural excerpts that have liturgical significance, including Deut 8:5–10 together with passages that variously appear also in the *tefillin* from Qumran (Deut 5:1–6:3; Deut 10:12–11:21; Exod 12:43–13:16; and the Song of Moses from Deut 32).[99] As reconstructed, the scroll would have been c. 12.5 cm high with fourteen lines per column. It has average-sized margins (15–17 mm on top, and 14–15 mm on bottom), formal Herodian script (c. 3 mm), and line spacing (c. 6–7 mm). 4QDeut^{q} may have contained only the Song of Moses (Deut 32:1–43). It is a small format scroll (11.4 cm high, 11 lines), and presents the Song of Moses in stichometric arrangement, calculated to end with verse 43 at the bottom of the column at the end of the scroll, without the narrative at the end of Deut 32.[100] It is well-prepared with large margins (bottom margin 28–29 mm), and average-sized script (3 mm, formal Herodian) and line spacing (7–9 mm). 4QDeut^{k1} contains passages found regularly on the *tefillin* (Deut 5 and 11) as well as the Song of Moses (Deut 32) that appears also in 4QDeut$^{j,\ q}$ and one of the *tefillin* (4QPhyl^{n}). It is probably small format (13+ lines), but the scroll height is uncertain; like 4QDeut^{q} it has large bottom margin (31 mm) and average script size (3 mm) and line spacing (6 mm).[101]

Especially striking in these cases are the similarities with the selection of passages in the *tefillin* (see below). In general, the excerpted texts with liturgical selections have a similar profile as the short books listed in Table 6: these are all of small format but otherwise have average sizes of script, line spacing, and margins, and are carefully prepared. Most of them

---

[98] Cf. ESHEL 1991, 117–154; WHITE CRAWFORD 1995, 117–128.

[99] DUNCAN 1995, 75–76, 79. The position of Deut 8:5–10 in the scroll is uncertain. It is possible that some excerpted texts might have served as master texts for copying tefillin (George Brooke, private communication).

[100] SKEHAN/ULRICH 1995, 137–138.

[101] DUNCAN 1995, 93–98.

are fine enough to be commercial copies, but in any case, the major concern is portability not using the least amount of parchment.

Bracketing off these as special cases, it does seem that there is a tendency to treat scriptural scrolls in a special manner: generally in large format with generous layout, frequently with characteristics of *de luxe* scrolls, rarely on papyrus, and never as an opisthograph.

Rule books as a group have a rather different profile. Besides the observation made earlier that they are more likely to have copies on papyrus and opisthographs, they are also more likely to be copied in compact editions and/or more rustic personal copies. The table below lists a selection of the most useful samples for comparison (including MMT, which, although not a rule book, occurs in multiple copies and explicitly defines a religious community over against others in terms of Torah practice).

Table 7: *Rules and Legal Texts*

	Scroll ht. (cm)	Column # Lines	Margins (mm) Top	Margins (mm) Bottom	Lines (mm) Spacing	Lines (mm) Let. ht.
Serek ha-Yahad						
1QS	24.1	26, 27	13–20	15–26	8	3
4QpapS[c]	20.1*	24*	14	20	7	4
4QS[b]	12.5	13	17	11	8	2
4QS[d]	8.4*	13	12	—	5	1.5
4QS[f]	8.3*	10	10–13	—	7	2
4QS[j]	4.4	10	5	2	4	1.5
Damascus Document						
4QD[a]	19+	24–25	10+		~7.5	2.8–4.2
War Scroll						
1QM	~20*	20	33	—	6–8 (7.3)	2–2.5
4QM[a]	12.8*	24*	14	13+	4–4.5	2
4QM[c]	9+	14	8	5+	~5.7	~2.5
MMT						
4Q394	17	20	11–12	18–23	~5.5	3–3.5
4Q399	7.2	11	10	10.5–11.5	~4.5	2

Of the War Scroll, there is a large, elegant copy (1QM) that is one of the very few non-scriptural *de luxe* scrolls from Qumran, but there are also copies that are much more compact: 4QM[c] is about half the height, and 4QM[a] squeezes in more lines than 1QM in less space by allowing about half the space between lines and for margins, giving the whole a much

more cramped appearance. The Serek ha-Yahad (Community Rule) also has two large copies – one on parchment and one on papyrus, neither of which could be called a *de luxe* edition – but also much more compact copies, the smallest of which (4QS^{j}) is less than one fifth the height of 1QS. The two smallest copies (4QS^{f} and 4QS^{j}) probably only contain excerpts, perhaps for liturgical use. The miniature scroll 4QS^{j} is only 4.4 cm high, with a very small writing block: the column height is 3.8 cm, with ten lines written in tiny script (1.5 mm) on narrow lines (4 mm). The single surviving fragment preserves the end of the *Maskil* psalm (1QS 11:14–22). Such a tiny manuscript could not have contained all of the material of 1QS, but probably contained only the final psalm (1QS 9:26b–11:22), perhaps starting with the statutes of the *Maskil* (1QS 9:12–26a). This would make a scroll of 6 or 7 columns respectively (c. .6 or .7 m in length accordingly, not including handling sheets). It is possible that this would have been a liturgical scroll, given the prominence of the poetic enumeration of times of prayer (1QS 9:26b–10:16a).[102] It is also probable that the small scroll of 4QS^{f} (est. c. 8.3 cm high, with 10 lines/column) contained just the statutes and psalm of the *Maskil* (1QS 9:12–11:22). Its extant content in 5 columns includes a bit less than half of this section: the whole would make a scroll of 11 columns and at least 1 m in length, not including handling sheets.

The halakhic work known as MMT also has one large (4Q394) and otherwise mostly smaller copies (e.g., 4Q399). Copies of the Damascus Document do not differ so much in size (all seem to be medium to large sized) as in quality. 4QD^{a} is one of the largest copies, but in contrast to other copies has a decidedly unprofessional appearance. It is written on a "sheepskin which had not been thoroughly dehaired," in an "[i]diosyncratic Hasmonaean semi-cursive hand" that appears "rapid and careless," with a striking variation of letter size and unusually high amount of errors and corrections; in short, the editor thinks it is probably a personal copy.[103]

With these summaries for comparative background, we can return to the prayer scrolls. The first category consists of liturgical prose prayers.

---

[102] Cf. ALEXANDER 2006, 201.
[103] J. BAUMGARTEN 1996, 2, 22.

Table 8: *Scrolls of Liturgical Prose Prayers*

	Scroll	Columns	Margins (mm)		Lines (mm)	
	Height (cm)	# Lines	Top	Bottom	Spacing	Let ht
Daily Prayers						
4Qpap503	~15*	~22*	10+	25+	~5	2–3
Words of Luminaries						
4Q504	~13.5*	22	—	13	~5	2–2.5
4Qpap506	—	—	—	—	7–10 (~8)	~4–5
Festival Prayers						
1Q34	—	—	—	—	~7	~2
4Q507	—	—	—	27	8–9	3–4
4Q508	—	—	—	—	9–10	3–4
4Qpap509	?	19+	—	22+	5–10 (~6.3)	2.5–3
(Festival Prayers?)						
4Qpap502	?	18+	6+	17+	6–7 (~6.4)	2.5–3
Purification Ritual						
4Qpap512	~15*?	~16*?	20	30	4.5–8	3–3.5
4Q414	~12.5*?	13*	18+	—	6–8 (~7)	3
4Q284	7*+	11*+	12+?	—	~6	2

The texts in this grouping are mostly in small fragments, and it is difficult to obtain useful measurements. To the degree that the overall size of scrolls can be estimated, these are of small-medium dimensions: 12.5–15 cm high with 13–22 lines per column. None of the scrolls are necessarily larger than this, although two are possibly of larger format. According to the tentative reconstructions by the editor, 4Q502 would have about 36 lines per column and measure about 25 cm high, and the opisthograph 4Q509 would have about 41 lines per column and measure at least 28 cm high.[104] The former is possible but uncertain, and the latter seems impossible with regard to the text the verso (4Q496) if it is a copy of the War Scroll: a more likely size for this scroll is about 22 cm, and at most 30 lines per column for 4Q509.[105] One of the scrolls with purification

[104] BAILLET 1982, 81–89, 190–191.

[105] The fragments assigned to the first four columns of 4Q496 on the verso correspond to the content of about three columns of 1QM, which has 20 lines per column and a column height of about 14 cm (and sheet height of c. 20 cm). If 4Q496 had similar content to 1QM in these columns, as seems likely, then 4Q496 could not have much more than about 20 lines (at c. 8 mm line spacing) and a sheet height of c. 22 cm (the letter

rituals (4Q284) could be a miniature scroll with as few as 11 lines, but this is uncertain.

More noticeably, most of these scrolls have a rustic appearance, with narrow line spacing relative to letter size, and uneven line spacing. For example, 4Q504 is the best-preserved copy of Words of the Luminaries (Divre Hame'orot), a collection of petitions for days of the week.[106] It was written on a parchment scroll approximately 13.5 cm high and 1.7 m long. The scribe wrote in cramped lines (c. 4–6 mm) with a slightly smaller than average script (2–2.5 mm) in order to cram in 22 lines per column, and yet still ran out of room on his scroll after writing 21 columns, and had to write the last two columns on the reverse. (The margins were probably small, with 13 mm attested for the bottom margin). There is additional evidence of poor planning and unprofessional execution: the scroll was not ruled, and the letter size, lines, line spacing, and margins between columns are all very uneven. Especially toward the last columns on the recto, the letters become increasingly cramped. Between some columns the margins are so narrow that the longest lines from one column touch or cross into the following column. The scribe made a large number of errors, especially of haplography, which he corrected by squeezing in the correction above the line. In one case (1–2 recto vi 8) the correction extends well into the following column, requiring him to leave an extra large gap between those lines in that column.[107] This also shows that the scribe corrected as he went. This is clearly a personal scroll copied with little care and/or little expertise. Much the same could be said for 4Q503 and 4Q512, which were discussed earlier.

Only four of these scrolls have average line spacing greater than double the letter height: three copies of Festival Prayers (1Q34+34bis, 4Q507, 4Q508) and a copy of Purification Ritual (4Q284), and these have the appearance of more careful preparation: straighter and more evenly spaced lines, and more even letter height. None of the scrolls in this group remotely qualify as *de luxe* scrolls. On the basis of large margin (30 mm) and few corrections (32 lines between), TOV listed 4QpapRitPur B

height of 3 mm of 4Q496 vs. 2–2.5 mm of 1QM would roughly make up the difference of coverage).

[106] The following description is based on the comprehensive reconstruction of the document by H. STEGEMANN with 23 columns, presented in CHAZON 1991. An independent reconstruction by PUECH 1988, 407–409 achieved similar results, but with 20 columns. Cf. FALK 1998, 63–68.

[107] I follow here the explanation of PUECH 1988, 409, rather than that of BAILLET 1982, 150, who treated this line (1–2 recto vii 10) as a blank line between prayers.

(4Q512) as a *de luxe* scroll, but it can have no claim to such a status: it is a crudely executed copy on the back of another work, with uneven, cramped lines.[108] As noted earlier, these scrolls have a high percentage of copies on papyrus and as opisthographs, and as a whole most of these seem likely to be personal copies.

Table 9: *Liturgical Prose Prayers Summary*

	Total	Papyrus	% Papyrus	Opisthograph	% Opisthograph
Daily Prayers	1	1	100%	1	100%
DibHam	2	1	50%	1	50%
Fest Pr	4	1	25%	1	25%
4Q502	1	1	100%		0%
Rit Pur	3	1	33.3%	2	66.6%
Overall	11	5	45.5%	5	45.5%

The second grouping consists of scrolls of sectarian religious poetry.

Table 10: *Scrolls of Sectarian Religious Poetry*

	Scroll	Columns	Margins (mm)		Lines (mm)	
	Height (cm)	# Lines	Top	Bottom	Spacing	Let. ht.
Hodayot						
1QH[a]	35–35.5*	41, 42	—	20	7.5	A: 2.5–3 C: 3–4[109]
4Q427	17*	16–23	—	17	5.5–9.0	2.0–2.5
4Q428	~23*	22–24*	16	30	8.8–10	2.5–3.0
4Q429	10.3	12	9	16	5–8	2.5–3.0
4Q431	18–19*	19–21	—	25	7.5–9.5	2.5
4Qpap432	22+*	17*	22	—	11–15	4

[108] TOV 2004, 127. The lines in places are close enough that they touch, e.g., frg. 131. It should also be noted that the top margin is not 3 cm as TOV reports but 2 cm (frg. 9); the bottom margin (frg. 34, 39) is 3 cm. By very definition, opisthographs cannot be *de luxe* copies; they are the cheapest form of production (KENYON 1975, 63–4). The margins on 4Q512 are large, but given that it was using the reverse side of an existing scroll, there may have been plenty of space and no need to economize further. Margins on luxury papyri could be much larger yet (KENYON lists margins up to 3 inches; ibid., 60).

[109] There are two main scribal hands in the scroll. Scribe A wrote in a skilled and elegant hand up to 19:25, and Scribe C wrote in a larger and somewhat shaky hand from 19:29 to the end of the scroll. Scribe B wrote the few lines between. Cf. STEGEMANN/SCHULLER 2009, 241–242.

ShirShabb						
4Q400	12.7	21	10–13	11	~5	2
4Q403	18+*	50	11	—	3–4	1.5
4Q405	21–22*	25*	—	—	6–9	2.5–3.5
11Q17	17–22*	19–25	—	—	7–8	1.3–2
Mas 1k	21.5*	26	17–19	20–22	7	~3
Berakhot						
4Q286	12.5+	13+	20	11+	7.5–8	2.5–3
4Q287	8.2	13	9	8–10	5.5	2–2.5
Barkhi Nafshi						
4Q434	14+*	18+	14	22	7–8	3
4Q436	~9.7	10	12.5	20	7–8	2.5–3
4Q437	15–15.4+	16	13	16	6.5–8	3

This table includes only representative examples. There are 8 scrolls of Hodayot psalms (1QH^{a}, 1QH^{b}, 4Q427–432) and 5 scrolls with similar poetry.[110] The most complete copy (1QH^{a}) is a very large scroll (41–42 lines; approximately 35 cm high), and is one of the very few non-scriptural scrolls that qualifies as a *de luxe* scroll. It is laid out with generously spaced lines and elegant, even script – at least for the first 19 columns written by Scribe A. The format would seem to be deliberately large for a scroll that would have been approximately 4.5 m long. The only other copy (4QH^{b} = 4Q428) that contains the full collection of psalms as 1QH^{a} presents them in a significantly smaller format scroll (c. 23 cm high, with about 22–24 lines per column), but in a scroll over twice as long (est. c. 9.5 m). 4QH^{b} is still of large size and has generous line spacing (three times the letter height), but is written in a less formal hand ("semi-formal Hasmonaean script" with an idiosyncratic tendency to curve many letters).[111] All the other copies seem to have contained smaller collections of psalms, and were smaller format scrolls. The smallest is 4QH^{c} (4Q429), which is barely over 10 cm high, with only 12 lines per column. In this sized format, even though it probably contained only the so-called "Teacher Hymns," the scroll would have been longer than 1QH^{a} (est. c. 5 m).[112] The only papyrus copy, 4QpapH^{f} (4Q432), probably contained the same material as 4QH^{c}, but in a larger format: over 22 cm

[110] The classification of Hodayot-like fragments is problematic; cf. SCHULLER 2000, 182–193. Publications:. SCHULLER 1999, 69–254; STEGEMANN/SCHULLER 2009; LANGE 2000, 347–348.

[111] SCHULLER 1999, 129.

[112] SCHULLER 1999, 178–179.

high, with about 17 lines per column in large script (c. 4 mm) and very large but irregular line spacing (11–15 mm). Consequently, despite the larger format, the scroll would have been about the same length (est. c. 5 m).[113]

Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice is a collection of thirteen poems describing angelic worship in the heavenly sanctuary, probably as a communal ritual.[114] The content is very roughly about a third the extent of the large collection of Hodayot attested in 1QH[a] and 4QH[b]. The best preserved of the 9 copies from Qumran, 4QShirShab[f] (4Q405), would also apparently have been the largest format, reconstructed as about 21–22 cm high with about 25 lines per column. This is roughly comparable to the format of 4QH[b], but it would be just a bit over one third of the length (est. c. 3.5 m vs. est. c. 9.5 m). It seems deliberately a large and generous format. By comparison, 4QShirShab[d] (4Q403) is remarkable for the efforts to conserve space: the reconstructed height of the scroll would have been a bit shorter (18+ cm) but with twice as many lines (c. 50 vs. c. 25), squeezed in by using very small script (only 1.5 mm), narrow lines (3–4 mm), and small margins (top margin 11 mm).[115] The extraordinary nature of this scroll is evident in that this is one of only six parchment scrolls from Qumran to have 50 or more lines, and all the others are scriptural scrolls and range between 2–3 times the height.[116] Since the main concern does not seem to be portability, it would seem that the scribe was mostly motivated by cost, to use as few sheets of parchment as possible. The scroll would have been as short as about 1.25 m with 11 columns.[117]

---

[113] SCHULLER 1999, 210–211.

[114] For editions, cf. NEWSOM 1998, 173–401. Cf. also ALEXANDER 2006, 15. A copy found at Masada is listed in the table above merely for comparative purposes and is not taken into account in the statistics for Qumran.

[115] The estimated column height is 16.8 cm; the preserved top margin is 11 mm; the bottom margin was not preserved, but it can be assumed to have been at least the size of the top margin.

[116] Cf. TOV 2004, 89; the reconstructed height of 4QExod–Lev[f] is mistakenly listed as 30 cm, but it would have been at least 37 cm for the estimated 60 lines and margins (the bottom 24 lines + bottom margin measure 15 cm). There is also one papyrus scroll with over 50 lines (ibid., 90), a copy of Jubilees (4QpapJub[h]) with est. 54 lines; I calculate an estimated scroll height of at least 34 cm. Curiously, TOV lists 4QShirShabb[d] in the category of the very largest scrolls that may have been a *de luxe* scroll, apparently purely on the basis of the unusually large number of lines, cf. TOV 2004, 89, 129. It is far from being either a large scroll or a *de luxe* scroll.

[117] My estimate is based on comparison with 4Q405 which would cover probably about 21 cols (13 cols for songs 6–13, according to the reconstruction of NEWSOM 1998,

Given the unusual format it is not a commercial copy, and the minute script and narrow lines make it difficult to imagine as useful in the course of a liturgical performance. It is more likely as a scholar's personal copy for study. Consistent with this idea, the scroll is skillfully executed, but shows a large number of corrections with deletion dots and interlinear writing.[118] 4QShirShabb[a] (4Q400), on the other hand, was prepared with completely different considerations, of which portability seems to be the primary concern. It is 12.7 cm high, just a bit over half the height of 4Q405, but only a few less lines per column (21 vs. est. 25). The script size and line spacing, while a bit smaller than average (2 mm and c. 5 mm), retain the quality of easy readability. This scroll is conceivable as intended for use in a ritual setting, although that of course does not mean it was. In any case, these three examples illustrate three very different formats for the same text (there is no evidence of different recensions or extracted copies), and these different priorities are probably related in some way to different intentions for the scrolls.

The work known as Berakhot is a collection of liturgical blessings and curses, with instructions for communal recitation.[119] The best preserved copy, 4QBer[a], (4Q286) is very finely executed in formal Herodian script, with generously-spaced and even lines (7.5–8 mm) and large margins (top margin 20 mm). The height of the scroll is uncertain: it was at least 12.5 cm high with 13+ lines per column, but probably not much larger. The only other copy that allows measurements, 4QBer[b] (4Q287), is a miniature scroll that seems designed for portability (8.2 cm high, 13 lines) with narrow line spacing (5.5 mm) and small script (2 mm), but still eminently clear and readable. It is not certain for what occasion these blessings and curses were intended, but such blessing and curse recitals were an important part of the ritual life of the sectarian community, including at the annual sectarian covenant ceremony that involved new

---

309–15); this estimate does not include handling sheets. If the primary concern was portability, the scribe could have used shorter sheets with fewer lines/column and a much longer scroll.

[118] TOV 2004, 253. It seems that the scribe made corrections as he wrote, e.g., the deletions at 1 i 37, 42 and 1 ii 12 are followed immediately by the correct text. ALEXANDER 2006, 15 notes that *ShirShabb* shows a very stable text, and this may have to do with the conservative nature of ritual texts.

[119] NITZAN 1998, 1–74. Of the 5 scrolls assigned to this work, 3 have some overlaps (4Q286, 4Q287, 4Q288); the other 2 (4Q289–290) are related on somewhat tenuous grounds.

members.[120] A need for portable copies of such collections would be natural.

The collection of hymns known as Barkhi Nafshi also survives in at least one miniature copy (c. 9.7 cm high; 10 lines) that prioritizes portability rather than thrift: the scroll is beautifully produced with average letter size (2.5–3 mm) and generously-spaced, even lines (7–8 mm). Although the scroll was ruled for 11 lines, the scribe used only 10, apparently to allow a larger bottom margin. This format is not merely related to a small content, since the other copies that can be measured are at least 50% larger in size, with 16 and at least 18 lines respectively.

Table 11: *Sectarian Religious Poetry Summary*

	Total	Papyrus	% Papyrus	Opisthograph	% Opisthograph
ShirShabb	9	0	0%	0	0%
Berakhot	5	0	0%	0	0%
Barkhi Nafshi	5	0	0%	0	0%
Hodayot	8	1	12.5%	0	0%
Hodayot-like	5	1	20%	1	20%
Overall	32	2	6%	1	3%

Among these poetic scrolls with sectarian associations there are only two papyri and one opisthograph. Not one of the nine copies of the mystical Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice is on papyrus or an opisthograph.

The third grouping consists of various prayers and poems to ward off demons. Esther Eshel distinguishes between incantations for exorcising demons (including 11QPsAp[a] [11Q11], 4Q560, and 8Q5) and apotropaic hymns intended to frighten demons (including 4Q510–11; 4Q444; 6Q18).[121] The latter are more likely for regularized use for general protection of the community from evil, and the former for ad hoc situations of healing individuals deemed to be stricken by demons.[122] In most cases, the fragments give little idea of the overall size or nature of the scrolls, but a few observations are possible.

---

[120] NITZAN suggests that *Berakhot* was a version of benedictions for the covenant ceremony, although this is problematic since the blessings and curses are of a fundamentally different nature than those described in 1QS 1:18–2:18; cf. NITZAN 2000, 263–271.

[121] ESHEL 2003, 395–415. 11Q11 might better be classified as a collection of apotropaic hymns, as it is regarded by some scholars.

[122] E.g., 11Q David's Compositions mentions four songs of David for reciting over the demon-possessed (11Q5 27:9–10).

Table 12: *Scrolls of Exorcism and Apotropaic Prayers and Poems*[123]

	Scroll	Columns	Margins (mm)		Lines (mm)	
	Height (cm)	# Lines	Top	Bottom	Spacing	Let. ht.
Songs of the Sage						
4Q510	~10.5	9	17+	13+	8.6	2
4Q511	~19*	18*	24	25	8	3–4
Incantation						
4Q444	8.2+	12	6+	—	5.5–6	2.5–3
Apocryphal Psalms (11QPsAp^{a})						
11Q11	9.5+	15+	—	—	5–8 (~6)	3
6QpapHymn						
6Q18	—	7+	11+	18+	6–10	3–4
Livret Magique ar						
4Q560	—	8+	—	—	7–8	2–3
8QHymn						
8Q5	—	6+	10+	9+	7–8	~3

The Songs of the Sage contains songs to be uttered in the first person singular by the *Maskil* to terrify spirits. It is possible, then, that only the ritual expert known as the *Maskil* would use such a scroll, and that he would have use of a portable copy as a ritual book.[124] On the other hand, the songs also refer to the praise of the community, and it is not impossible that a song in the voice of the *Maskil* could also be used by the community, as NEWSOM has suggested for the so-called Hymns of the Teacher in the Hodayot.[125] In any case, a portable ritual copy could hardly take a better form than the miniature scroll 4Q510, which was slightly larger than 10.5 cm high with only 9 lines per column. The scroll is carefully inscribed in a small (2 mm) but clear and elegant Herodian script with straight lines that are evenly and widely spaced (8.6 mm). It seems to have had generous margins (top margin at least 17 mm). The other copy, 4Q511, is much better preserved and reveals that the work was of significant length. According to the editor's reconstruction, it had at least nine columns with 18 lines per column and would have been about 19 cm high, with large

[123] Publications: BAILLET 1982, 215–219, 219–262; CHAZON 1999, 367–378; BAILLET 1962, 133–136, 161–162; GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ/TIGCHELAAR/VAN DER WOUDE 1998, 181–205; PUECH 2009, 291–302.

[124] On the *Maskil*, cf. NEWSOM 1990, 373–382.

[125] Cf. NEWSOM 2004, 197–198. NEWSOM refers to these as Hymns of the Leader, and argues that they nurture a generic myth of leadership.

margins (24 and 25 mm) and widely spaced lines (8 mm). Just to contain the surviving fragments, it would have been more than 1.5 m in length.[126] The script is larger than 4Q510 (3–4 mm) and dated a bit later (c. turn of era),[127] but is less formal and consistent. Comparing the two, the compact size of 4Q510 is due neither to a limited content (if it contained the same collection as 4Q511, which seems probable, it would have been more than 3 m) nor a priority to economize (it is the higher quality of the two, and with even wider line spacing), but rather a priority on portability.

4Q444, containing an apotropaic hymn to frighten spirits, is unique among all the scrolls from Qumran. It consists of three small pieces of skin joined vertically to form a single sheet on which is inscribed a column of 12 lines, with part of a second column visible. CHAZON considered the possibility that "this special codicological feature is related to the folding of the manuscript and its magical use,"[128] although it is also possible that it represents simply the use of scraps for making a personal copy.

11Q11 contains at least three exorcistic or apotropaic songs, which include ritual instructions for use by an individual at times of demonic attack (e.g., "[An incanta]tion in the name of YHW[H. Invoke at an]y time the heav[ens. When]he comes to you in the nig[ht,] you will say to him…," 5:4–5).[129] The badly damaged scroll contains at least six columns with at least 15 lines per column, and the scroll would have been somewhat more than 9.5 cm high and .71 m long, but it is impossible to tell how much larger than this. Thus, although it seems likely that it would have been a portable scroll for personal use, it is not possible to verify this. In any case, the scroll is expertly made, with beautiful Herodian script and evenly spaced lines, both of average size and proportion (3 mm, c. 6 mm). It has a separate handling sheet with part of the rolling stick still attached.

These groupings of scrolls also highlight the differences with regard to the use of papyrus and opisthographs.

---

[126] ESHEL 2003, 406 puzzlingly states that 4Q511 is "one of the largest manuscripts found in cave 4." There are in fact many scrolls from cave 4 of much larger size, both in height and length.

[127] BAILLET 1982, 219 cf. 215.

[128] CHAZON 1999, 368n3; she notes without elaboration that S. SHAKED privately expressed his opinion that this is not the case.

[129] GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ/TIGCHELAAR/VAN DER WOUDE 1998, 199–200.

Table 13: *Comparisons*

	Total	Papyrus	% Pap	Opisthogr.	% Op.
Group 1: Liturgical Prose Prayers	11	5	45.5%	5	45.5%
Group 2: Sectarian Poetry	32	2	6%	1	3%
Group 3: Exorcism; apotropaic	7	1	14%	0	0%
Group 4: Rules and Legal	40	6	15%	3	7.5%
Group 5: Scriptural Scrolls	~200	2–6	1–3%	0	0%

Of these sample groupings of scrolls, we may make the following broad generalizations. Scrolls of liturgical prose prayers tend to be written in a compact format to economize space, and to have a more rustic appearance. They have the highest percentage of any genre found at Qumran of copies written on papyrus and/or as an opisthograph. Most are likely personal copies. With scrolls of sectarian religious poetry, there is more diversity in format: both elegant and rustic copies, and both larger and small format copies of the same text. Copies on papyrus and opisthographs are rare. This group is closest to the profile of the rules and legal texts. Scrolls of exorcism incantations and apotropaic hymns tend to be small format but mostly show signs of quality and professional preparation as portable scrolls. There are no opisthographs and only a single papyrus. This last group is most similar to the treatment of the small scriptural books that in the later synagogue were read at festivals. One can well imagine a commercial market for such portable scrolls. Otherwise, on the whole the physical profiles of prayer scrolls at Qumran are unlike those of scriptural scrolls, and this is most markedly the case with liturgical prose prayers.

This is rather different than KLINGHARDT's expectation that prayer scrolls would be treated as sacred and esoteric objects. There can be little doubt that certain of the prayers were for restricted use: exorcism songs for the *Maskil*, and perhaps some other songs associated with the *Maskil*, including the mystical Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. But there is no discernible evidence that they were treated in any particular way as esoteric. Most notably, although a number of texts found at Qumran were written in a cryptic script, it seems generally not to have been used for prayer texts.[130] The manner of production of the prayer texts at Qumran does not suggest that the writing itself is invested with efficacious value. Rather, the writing is commonplace and varies in quality. This suggests

---

[130] Cf. PFANN 2000; TOV 2002, 227–228.

that the writing of prayers is regarded merely as a record of and prompt for what is an oral performance.

It is not possible in the scope of this study to discuss each scroll of prayers or psalms from Qumran, and so the preceding survey is meant to be a representative treatment based on groupings of texts most likely used in the course of prayer. It is important, however, to describe one further category of tangential relevance, the *tefillin*.

Excursus: The Tefillin

The numerous copies of *tefillin* (or "phylacteries") found at Qumran must be bracketed as objects of secondary relevance to our topic because they are not, strictly speaking, prayer manuscripts. According to traditional rabbinic practice, *tefillin* are sealed pouches worn on the forehead and left arm during morning prayer, containing four passages of Torah understood to command the practice (Exod 13:1–10, 11–16; Deut 6:4–9; 11:13–21). Even in this usage, the passages do not represent prayer texts – despite some overlap with the recital of the Shema (Deut 6:4–9; Deut 11:13–21; Num 15:37–41) – but of commitment to Torah. Furthermore, it is not at all certain that *tefillin* in the Second Temple period such as found at Qumran had even this connection with prayer practice. COHN's recent study persuasively argues that the practice of wearing *tefillin* originated in the late Second Temple period as an amulet worn to ensure long-life, analogous to Greek magical practices.[131] He suggests that recital of the Shema may have originated as a protective magical practice as well, and he suggests its connection with *tefillin* as a recited consecration of the amulet, as is frequently attested for amulets in various cultures.[132] In any case, no text from Qumran mentions the use of *tefillin*, so we simply do not know if these artifacts were used in any particular way in connection with prayer. For the present study, however, they are useful in illustrating private textual artifacts and shedding light on the difference between professional and personal copies.

Remains of some 25 leather *tefillin* housings were found at Qumran: 14 with four compartments, 2 with three compartments, and the rest with one compartment.[133] The ones with multiple compartments would have a sepa-

---

[131] COHN 2008, 93.

[132] COHN 2008, 100–102.

[133] The data on the housings and the parchment slips is usefully summarized by COHN 2008, 56–67; cf. list in TOV 2002, 182–183. The main publications are BARTHÉLEMY/MILIK 1955, 72–76 (1QPhyl 1–4), BAILLET 1962, 149–161 (8Q34), MILIK

rate inscribed parchment slip in each compartment; those with one compartment would have a single slip or wad with multiple passages. Only a few were recovered with their slips intact; other slips were recovered independent of their housing. Scholars have tended to harmonize the evidence as much as possible with rabbinic norms and so distinguish those with multiple versus single compartments as "head" versus "arm" *tefillin*, and differentiate between those in which the selection and order of passages is generally in line with rabbinic norms and those that include additional passages, especially the Decalogue.[134] Thus, Józef T. MILIK distinguished two groups that he called "Pharisaic-type" and "Essene-type" *tefillin* for convenience, but this has yielded the impression that the *tefillin* represent normative versus sectarian practice. Emanuel TOV adds further nuance by integrating a wider range of scribal characteristics and differentiating three groups.[135] Group 1 includes the majority of the *tefillin* from Qumran (4QPhyl A, B, J, K, L–N, O, P, Q and probably G and I). These he judges not in accordance with rabbinic norms with regard to passages (additional verses and/or passages) and scribal features (the presence of corrections; breaking words at the end of lines; writing on both sides of the parchment), but they show the pattern of orthographic and morphological features TOV identifies as characteristic of what he calls the Qumran Scribal School. TOV suggests they were probably copied at Qumran. A small number of *tefillin* belong to Group 2 (4QPhyl C, D–F, R and S), which do not show "Qumran" orthography and morphology, and are in accord with rabbinic norms concerning passages.[136] TOV suggests that these are from Pharisaic circles. A third group of *tefillin* (1Q13, 8Q3, XQPhyl) he identifies as not in accord with either Qumran orthography or rabbinic norms. As attractive as it is to seek patterns in the data, there are difficulties with this classification. Of the few texts in Group 2, only 4QPhyl C really is meaningful. The group 4QPhyl D–F was found together

---

1962, 178 (5Q8), MILIK 1977, 48–79 (4QPhyl A–U), and for a set of four tefillin in a housing that probably came from Qumran but an unknown cave (XQPhyl 1–4), cf. YADIN 1969. The unreadable wad 11Q31 with micro-writing from cave 11 is also probably from a tefillin. Cf. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ/TIGCHELAAR/VAN DER WOUDE 1998, 445–446.

[134] MILIK 1977, 47. It should be noted that there is no certainty that the distinction between one compartment and multiple compartments corresponds to arm versus head *tefillin*.

[135] TOV 2004, 270–71; cf. TOV 2012, 30–32. On rabbinic norms for *tefillin*, cf. bMen 34a–37b, 42b–43b; Massekhet Tefillin 9.

[136] The *tefillin* from Murabaat and Seelim dating to the 2nd c. CE also are in accord with the rabbinic norms for the passages; TOV lists these as a fourth group.

in a housing with three compartments, not four as rabbinic regulations require; and there is no evidence that it contained Deut 6:4–9. 4QPhyl R and S each contain only a single passage and so are not sufficient to judge, and R is inscribed on both sides. Even more significantly, the large number of *tefillin* in Group 1 is too diverse to represent a sectarian scribal practice, as Yehuda B. COHN notes. Instead, "they most probably represent some form of popular practice. If they were amulets… then it seems even more likely that they were part of the religion of the common people."[137]

Some features of the *tefillin* will reinforce the conclusion that most of these are personal-made copies. First, there are signs that a major concern in the production of many of the *tefillin* was economy, not just size. Concern for size is evident in micro-writing (letters typically less than 1 mm high), the absence of space between words, narrow lines, and the use of all available surface without leaving margins. But a concern for cost is evident in the choice of "thin leather of inferior quality with a rough surface and ragged edges, representing scraps of leather left over from hides used for the preparation of scrolls," often with irregular shapes.[138] Lines are consequently of uneven length, sometimes as short as a single word on narrow projections. They are frequently written on both sides of the parchment (at least 13 of approximately 33 distinguishable slips).

Second, a significant number of the *tefillin* show signs that they are not inscribed by a craftsman skilled in their production. The lines are often uneven, interlinear space is sometimes used to complete words and make corrections, words and passages are broken in awkward places, and particularly on *tefillin* inscribed on both sides the scribe misjudges the amount of space required, and in various other ways the execution appears clumsy (cf. examples below). This leaves open the possibility of a trained scribe with no expertise in making *tefillin* inscribing a personal copy.[139]

Third, diverse features of the *tefillin* are inconsistent with a well-defined norm. The selection of texts shows intention to include the four key passages about binding a sign on oneself (Exod 13:9, 16; Deut 6:8; 11:18), but otherwise there is little evidence for a clear norm about the extent of passages to include or the order. The maximum list of excerpts found among the Qumran *tefillin* include: Exod 12:43–13:10; Deut 5:1–6:9; Deut 10:12–11:21; Deut 32. Even more striking, however, is the layout of

---

[137] COHN 2008, 99.

[138] TOV 2004, 256–7. Cf. also MILIK 1977, 36.

[139] COHN 2008, 142 points out that tBer 6:10 "mentions people who made *tefillin* for themselves, as though this were a common procedure."

texts, the curiosities of which cannot all be explained by the constraints of irregularly shaped strips. The *tefillin* that are inscribed on both sides show some inclinations towards an aesthetic, but it seems to have almost nothing to do with content. The recto is usually orderly, with the text running across the widest dimension, starting at the top and filling up the entire space leaving no margins. The verso, in contrast, usually appears disorderly, and even intentionally so. It is inscribed perpendicular to the recto, even where this means creating an absurdly narrow column, sometimes as narrow as a single word.[140] The verso usually does not start at the top, but often in the lower half, even if it is directly following from the text on the front. There seems to be a desire to have the text on the verso end at the bottom of the slip, leaving any blank spaces in the middle of the sheet, even though this sometimes results in an awkward arrangement of the text. In breaking the text on the verso, there often seems to be no consideration for the content. A few examples may illustrate, focusing on those *tefillin* TOV associates with Qumran scribal practices.

4QPhyl A and B are both one-sheet *tefillin*, roughly rectangular, inscribed on both sides, with the verso perpendicular to the recto. On the recto of 4QPhyl A is inscribed Deut 5:1–6:3, followed immediately by 10:12–11:17. The verso carries on with Deut 11:18–21, but it starts some distance (indeterminable) down from the top. This is then followed immediately by Exod 12:43–13:7. This passage, probably extending to 13:16, seems to have been aligned with the bottom of the sheet. It did not contain the Shema (Deut 6:4–9), unless perhaps it was written at the top of the reverse, between Deut 11:17 and 18.

Although only the top left quarter of 4QPhyl B survives, the basic structure is clear. The recto similarly starts with Deut 5:1–6:3, and would have had room to contain Deut 6:4–9 and 10:12–11:21 (or a smaller selection). The verso is from the bottom right, and shows eight blank lines, then one line with Exod 13:16, followed by Exod 13:9b–15 which finishes in the bottom line. That is, after flipping the sheet and giving it a quarter turn, the scribe presumably started writing at the top of the verso Exod 12:43 (or so) as far as the middle of 13:9, then left a large blank section of at least 8 lines in the middle of the sentence, and continued writing Exod 13:9b–16. Misjudging the required space, he came to the

---

[140] BROOKE 2011, 131 has suggested that inscribing the verso perpendicular to the recto on a parchment may be inherited from the use of a papyrus exemplar. This is possible, but if so, it is still difficult to explain the striking variance with regard to content and order of passages, and peculiar layouts of the text of the verso.

bottom of the sheet at 13:15, and leaving the rest of the bottom line blank, moved up and wrote verse 16 just above that section.[141]

4QPhyl G–I are three slips surviving from a set of four, with the verso inscribed perpendicular to the recto. Peculiar to this set, the texts run in sequence on the rectos (G: Deut 5:1–21; H: Deut 5:22–6:5; [missing: Deut 10:12–11:22]; I: Deut 11:13–21 and Exod 12:43–13:10), and then on the versos (G: Exod 13:11–12; [missing: Exod 13:13–14a]; H: Exod 13:14b–16; I: Deut 6:6–7?). Whereas the rectos are completely filled, the versos have only a few lines written near the bottom of each. This is quite deliberate, and breaks up Exod 13:11–16 over the versos of three slips – even dividing in the middle of a sentence – where it could easily have fit on the verso of a single sheet. Moreover, Deut 6:4–9 is divided over the recto and verso of two different slips.

4QPhyl J–K are two irregularly shaped slips from a set of three or four, with the verso inscribed perpendicular to the recto. On the recto of J is Deut 5:1–24a, completely filling the triangular shape. The scribe then turned the sheet over, rotated a quarter turn, and wrote Deut 5:24b–28 in the bottom half until he ran out of space. Then he turned the sheet 180 degrees and wrote Deut 5:29–32 at the top until he again ran out of space. Finally, he turned the sheet 180 degrees once more and wrote Deut 6:2–3 directly below. This shows poor judgment of space, and an over-riding concern at all costs to leave blank space in the middle of the sheet. 4QPhyl K is rhomboid in shape. The recto fills up the full width completely with Deut 10:12–11:7, so that the top line is much longer than the bottom. On the verso, running perpendicular to the recto, the scribe continued to write Deut 11:7–10a at top, following the top edge. Then, breaking in the middle of a clause, he left several lines blank and continued to write Deut 11:10b–12 at the bottom following the bottom edge, so that the two parts are not remotely parallel. The gap in the middle seems to be left deliberately for reasons other than a sense division: the scribe even crammed in the last three letters of Deut 11:10a underneath at the end of the line, so as not to encroach on this blank space.

4QPhyl L–N also belong to a set that is probably missing one slip. The main oddities of this set are that passages are broken up between the recto and verso of different slips, the verso of each slip has a different layout, and the set includes Deut 32. Thus, Deut 5:1–33a is on the recto of L, and continues on the verso of M with Deut 5:33b–6:5. The latter passage is

---

[141] Cf. MILIK 1977, 51–52. It should be noted that Exod 13:9a and 13:16a are very similar, and this could have something to do with the unusual layout.

divided by leaving several blank lines between "Hear" and "Israel" in Deut 6:4, but it corresponds with the tendency to leave blank space in the middle of the verso rather than the top or bottom. Deut 6:6–9 could either be on the missing slip, or on the verso of L at the top, with the bottom left blank. N is inscribed on just one side with Deut 32 (the song of Moses). Curiously, the two last verses were written perpendicularly in a small pocket set aside at the left side: it seems this must be deliberate.

4QPhyl R is a single slip containing Exod 13:1–10. After writing Exod 13:1–7a on the recto, the scribe broke off in the middle of a clause with just one word at the beginning of the bottom line, then continued on the verso, toward the bottom, and perpendicular to the recto. He wrote 9 lines but ran out of room on the sheet in the middle of 13:10, so completed it on the line above the section he had just written.

Virtually every set is unique. The unusual treatment of the verso on many of the slips defies explanation related to content. It is possible that the concern to fill the top and bottom of the verso and leave a space in the middle without concern to the content could relate to a magical treatment of the text. Alternatively, it could be that the effort to leave the middle of the verso blank has to do with the way the sheets are folded and tied, so as to have an uninscribed surface on the exterior.[142] In any case, such *tefillin* cannot be the product of professionals who are expert at producing *tefillin*.

Conclusions

This study began by asking whether there was anything to be learned from the physical characteristics of prayer texts from Qumran. The fragmentary evidence is frustratingly incomplete and resists systematic comparison. Still, evaluation of the more readily identifiable data does suggest that there are some distinctive tendencies. (1) As a broad generalization, prayer texts found at Qumran are not treated as esoteric, nor are they treated similarly to scriptural manuscripts, which are rare on papyrus and never as opisthographs. (2) Collections of liturgical prose prayers are more commonly written on papyrus than any other genre of texts found at Qumran. They are also the major category of texts written on opisthographs, and especially as an intentional collection of texts. Such

[142] It may well be related to a concern that is evident in the intricate patterns of folding, "the general principle underlying them all is to avoid exposed ends", cf. YADIN 1969, 18.

scrolls are in most cases personal copies. There are also other features that point to a high tendency of liturgical texts as personal scrolls, for example the compact size of many of these scrolls, and 4Q504 running over onto the back of the scroll. (3) Of small format scrolls in general, there is a disproportionate percentage of prayer texts, but more important than this is the observation that in numerous instances the same work occurs in both larger and smaller formats. Although in general, the height of a scroll is related to the length of the work, a scribe may take special effort to make a scroll as compact as possible (small script size, narrow line spacing and margins) even to the point of sacrificing readability, or to make the scroll deliberately larger than it needs to be, to create an object of value (especially by means of large line spacing and margins). Furthermore, the reasons for making a compact scroll may either prioritize economy or portability. In combination with other features of workmanship (uniformity and elegance of script, evenly spaced and straight lines, grade of materials, etc.), it is possible to recognize some distinctive profiles of manuscripts, including economical and rustic personal copies, elegant commercial-grade portable copies, and large *de luxe* editions. Classifying individual manuscripts on such a scale is very speculative and is of little use in an absolute sense, but this study does highlight the *relative* contrast among these distinctions, and this will be useful for more nuanced comparisons. Thus, there is a very clear contrast between the typical profile of scriptural manuscripts, which have a high tendency toward large format and *de luxe* scrolls, and scrolls of liturgical prose prayers, which have a high tendency toward economical personal copies. Moreover, this study highlights the similarity in profile of small format scriptural scrolls – those later known among the Five Megillot, and extracted scriptural texts – which have liturgical use, and the scrolls of apotropaic and exorcism prayers: these tend to be professional quality portable copies, and suggest the possibility of a commercial demand for such scrolls. Also, the somewhat loose grouping of various sectarian poetic texts shows similar diversity to the rule texts: large copies both luxurious and rustic, to very small copies both skilled and unskilled. This suggests a wide range of uses and market for these texts, possibly including personal copies, scholar's study editions, and official and master copies. Again, it should be emphasized that such differentiation is meaningful only in a relative and heuristic manner to aid comparison, not as an absolute classification.

The study raises numerous questions for further consideration. What is the significance of the greater tendency of liturgical prose prayers to be on scrolls that look like personal copies? Were they for personal study, or use in the context of communal prayer as a prayer-book? Is there a distinction between prayers recited corporately – for which members might have their

own scrolls – and prayers led by a prayer leader? Is it possible to identify liturgical manuscripts used by a ritual leader such as the *Maskil* – which we might expect to be *de luxe* copies – or manuscripts used as master copies? I did not take scribal markings into account in this study because the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts prevents proportional comparisons, but the matter does need further consideration. Do any of the scribal markings have specifically liturgical functions? If so, are these based on liturgical tradition, or the owner's particular needs? Where the use of scribal markings and paragraphing practices differ among copies of the same work, are there any correlations to the manuscript profile or use (e.g., personal vs. commercial; study vs. liturgical)? Similarly, is there any such correlation with regard to the different treatments of the Divine Name?

On the basis of his rich assembly of detailed observations of scribal practices, Emanuel TOV has argued that there is a recognizable pattern of features (including orthography and morphology, paragraphing, scribal markings, corrections, and scroll preparation) that he identifies as a professional scribal practice associated with Qumran. According to his lists, most of the prayer scrolls discussed in this study represent Qumran scribal practice.[143] The results of the current study would not support a conclusion that this wide range of practice could be the result of a professional scribal school.[144] Although there are cases from Qumran where one scribe copied more than one work, Michael WISE is correct to argue that this should be far more common if these were produced by a particular scribal school.[145] Of the ten cases listed by TOV, two involve prayers (including several prayers by the same scribe as 1QS) and one involves a curse text.[146] Out of approximately 90 prayer scrolls, this is a miniscule fraction. Also, there is no case of more than one copy of the same prayer text by the same scribe. It seems to me that the evidence with regard to the prayer texts points in the direction of the general argument by WISE that a significant percentage of what was copied at Qumran consisted

---

[143] TOV 2004, 277–278.

[144] For a critique of TOV's theory of Scribal Schools, cf. TIGCHELAAR 2010, 173–205.

[145] Cf. WISE 1994, 124.

[146] TOV 2004, 23. The three relevant cases are as follows: (1) 4Q392, 4Q393 (joined), 4QpsEzek[d], and 4QapocrJer C[c]; (2) 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb, 1QpHab, 4QSam[c], 4Q441 Individual Thanksgiving A, 4Q443 Personal Prayer, and 4Q457b Eschatological Hymn, and corrections in 1QH[a]; (3) 4Q280 Curses, 5Q13 Rule, and possibly 5QS and 4QapocJer C[e].

of personal copies, some of which were copied by a small number of trained scribes, and that the majority of the scrolls were brought to Qumran from elsewhere.[147]

Finally, this study also suggests that there is more to be learned from cross-cultural analogies to prayers discovered at Qumran. For example, there are some intriguing analogies between the covenant ceremony with its prominent blessing and curse rituals and the ritual outlined in the Iguvine Tablets, which prescribes prayers at various occasions including the mustering of a congregation with blessings and curses. It may also be useful to compare the *tefillin* with various amulet practices, especially peculiarities of inscribing the verso and folding, and to compare the inscribed instruments of war mentioned in the War Scroll with various objects that are inscribed with incantations and curses in the ancient world.

Bibliography

ALEXANDER, P. S.: Mystical Texts. Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts (Library of Second Temple Studies 61 = Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 7), London 2006.

– and VERMES, G.: Serek ha-Yaḥad and Two Related Texts (Qumran Cave 4 19 = DJD 26), Oxford 1998.

BAILLET, M.: Textes des grottes 2Q, 3Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. In: Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumrân (DJD 3), ed. id. et al., Oxford 1962, 45–164.

– 4Q482–4Q520 (Qumrân Grotte 4 3 = DJD 7), Oxford 1982.

BARTHÉLEMY, D./MILIK, J. T.: Les Textes. In: Qumran Cave 1 (DJD 1), ed. D. BARTHÉLEMY et al., Oxford 1955, 43–155.

BAUMGARTEN, J.: Purification Liturgy. In: Halakhic Texts (Qumran Cave 4 25 = DJD 35), ed. id. et al., Oxford 1999, 123–129.

– The Damascus Document (4Q266–273) (Qumran Cave 4 13 = DJD 18), Oxford 1996.

BETZ, H. D.: The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation. Including the Demotic Spells, 2nd ed., Chicago 1997.

BREMER, J. M.: Greek Hymns. In: Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World (SGRR 2), ed. H. S. VERSNEL, Leiden 1981, 193–215.

BROOKE, G.: Between Scroll and Codex? Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs. In: On Stone and Scroll. Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies (BZAW 420), ed. J. K. AITKEN, Berlin 2011, 123–138.

[147] Cf. WISE 1994, 119–136. The idea of trained scribes making personal copies may also be suggested by the skilled but unprofessional appearance of the *tefillin*. TOV 2004, 24 notes that “… there is no indication that tefillin were copied by a separate group of scribes, and therefore the category of scribes specializing in sacred writings probably developed only in rabbinic circles.”

– 4QGenesis[d] Reconsidered. In: Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebelle Barrera. Florilegium Complutense (JSJSup 158), ed. A. P. OTERO et al., Leiden 2012, 51–70.
CHAPOT, F./LAUROT, B.: Corpus de prières grecques et romaines (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 2), Turnhout 2001.
CHAZON, E. G.: Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment. Vol. 1, ed. P. W. FLINT et al., Leiden 1998, 244–270.
– A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications. "Words of the Luminaries" (4QDibHam), Jerusalem 1991.
– Prayers. In: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 2 (Qumran Cave 4 20 = DJD 29), ed. id. et al., Oxford 1999, 343–378.
COHN, Y. B.: Tangled Up in Text. Tefillin and the Ancient World (BJS 351), Rhode Island 2008.
COTTON, H.: 4QAccount gr (Pl. XX). In: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea. Part 1 (Qumran Cave 4 26 = DJD 36), ed. S. PFANN et al., Oxford 2000, 294–295.
DAVILA, J. R.: 4QGen-Exod[a]–4QGen[k]. In: Genesis to Numbers (Qumran Cave 4 7 = DJD 12), ed. E. ULRICH et al., Oxford 1994, 1–78.
DUNCAN, J. A.: 4QDeut[j]–4QDeut[m]. In: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings (Qumran Cave 4 9 = DJD 14), ed. E. ULRICH et al., Oxford 1995, 75–116.
ENGELMANN, H. et al.: Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai. Vol. II (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien), Bonn 1973.
ESHEL, E.: Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: Die Dämonen. Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt, ed. A. LANGE et al., Tübingen 2003, 395–415.
– 4QDeut[n] – A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing. In: HUCA 62 (1991), 117–154.
– Ritual of Purification. In: Halakhic Texts (Qumran Cave 4 25 = DJD 35), ed. J. BAUMGARTEN et al., Oxford 1999, 135–154.
– and ESHEL, H.: 4Q448, Psalm 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa[a]. In: JBL 119 (2000), 645–659.
– and ESHEL, H./YARDENI, A.: Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer. In: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1 (Qumran Cave 4 6 = DJD 11), ed. id. et al, Oxford 1998, 403–426.
FALK, D. K.: Prayer in the Qumran Texts. In: The Cambridge History of Judaism. The Early Roman Period. Vol. 3, ed. W. HORBURY et al., Cambridge 1999, 852–876.
– The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Study of Ancient Jewish Liturgy. In: The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. T. H. LIM et al., Oxford 2010, 617–651.
– Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls (StTDJ 27), Leiden 1998.
FARAONE, C. A.: An Athenian Tradition of Dactylic Paeans to Apollo and Asclepius. Choral Degeneration or a Flexible System of Non-Strophic Dactyls. In: Mnemosyne 64 (2011), 206–231.
FORBES, R. J.: Studies in Ancient Technology. Vol. 5, Leiden 1966, 63–66.
FURLEY, W. D./BREMER, J. M.: Greek Hymns. Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period (STAC 9–10), Tübingen 2001.
GAGER, J. G.: Curse Tablets and Bindings Spells From the Ancient World, Oxford 1992.
GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, F. /TIGCHELAAR, E. J. /VAN DER WOUDE, A. S.: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31 (Qumran Cave 11 2 = DJD 23), Oxford 1998.
GILL, S. D.: Prayer. In: The Encyclopedia of Religion. Vol. 11, ed. M. ELIADE, New York 1987, 489–494.

GINZBERG, L.: Geonica 1. The Geonim and Their Halakic Writings (Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 1), New York 1968, 119–121.
GRAF, F.: Prayer in Magical and Religious Ritual. In: Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek Magic and Religion, ed. C. Faraone et al., Oxford 1991, 188–197.
HALDANE, J. A.: A Paean in the Philoctetes. In: The Classical Quarterly (N.S.) 13 (1963), 53–56.
HARAN, M.: Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period. The Transition from Papyrus to Skins. In: HUCA 54 (1983), 111–122.
HORBURY, W. and NOY, D.: Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt. With an Index of the Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica, Cambridge 1992.
JEANES, G.: Liturgy and Ceremonial. In: Liturgy in Dialogue. Essays in memory of Ronald Jasper, ed. P. BRADSHAW et al., London 1993, 9–27.
JENNINGS, Th. W. Jr., Liturgy. In: The Encyclopedia of Religion. Vol. 8, ed. M. ELIADE, New York 1987, 580–583.
KÄPPEL, L.: Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung (UaLG 37), Berlin 1992.
KENYON, F. G.: Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome, Hertford 1975.
KILEY, M.: Prayer from Alexander to Constantine. A Critical Anthology, London 1997.
KLINGHARDT, M.: Prayer Formularies for Public Recitation: Their Use and Function in Ancient Religion. In: Numen 46 (1999), 1–52.
LANGE, A.: 4QHodayot-like Text D (Pl. XXIV). In: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea. Part 1 (Qumran Cave 4 26 = DJD 36), ed. S. PFANN et al., Oxford 2000, 347–348.
– and MITTMANN-RICHERT, U.: Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre. In: The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series (DJD 39), ed. E. TOV, Oxford 2002, 115–164.
LARSON, E.: 4QNarrative Work and Prayer (Pl. XXVI). In: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea. Part 1 (Qumran Cave 4 26 = DJD 36), ed. S. PFANN et al., Oxford 2000, 369–386.
MILIK, J. T. : The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4, Oxford 1976.
– Textes de la grotte 5Q. In: Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumrân (DJD 3), ed. M. BAILLET et al., Oxford 1962, 167–197.
– Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128–4Q157). In: Qumrân Grotte 4. 2: Archéologie, Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (DJD 6), ed. R. DE VAUX et al., Oxford 1977, 33–90.
MILLARD, A. R.: Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus, Sheffield 2001.
NEWSOM, C.: Self as Symbolic Space. Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran (StTDJ 52), Leiden 2004.
– The Sage in the Literature of Qumran. The Functions of the Maskil. In: The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East, ed. J. G. GAMMIE et al., Winona Lake 1990, 373–382.
– Shirot ʿOlat Hashabbat. In: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1 (Qumran Cave 4 6 = DJD 11), ed. E. ESHEL et al., Oxford 1998, 173–401.
NITZAN, B.: Berakhot. In: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1 (Qumran Cave 4 6 = DJD 11), ed. E. ESHEL et al., Oxford 1998, 1–74.
– The Benedictions from Qumran for the Annual Covenant Ceremony. In: The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997, ed. L. H. SCHIFFMANN, Jerusalem 2000.
NOY, D. et al.: Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. Vol. 1. Eastern Europe (TSAJ 101), Tübingen 2004, 235–239.
PFANN, S. J.: Cryptic Texts. In: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea. Part 1 (Qumran Cave 4 26 = DJD 36), ed. id. et al., Oxford 2000, 515–701.

– and KISTER, M.: Words of the Maskil to all Sons of Dawn. In: Sapiential Texts. Part I (Qumran Cave 4 15 = DJD 20), ed. T. ELGVIN et al., Oxford 1997, 1–30.

PFIFFIG, A. J.: Religio Iguvina. Philologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studien zu den Tabulae Iguvinae mit Text und Übersetzung (DÖAW.PH 84), Vienna 1964.

POOLE, J. B. et al.: The Preparation of Leather and Parchment by the Dead Sea Scrolls Community. In: Technology and Culture. The International Quarterly of the Society for the History of Technology 3 (1962), 1–26.

PUECH, É.: Textes araméens. Deuxième partie (Qumran Grotte 4 27 = DJD 37), Oxford 2009.

– Review of M. Baillet, Qumrân Grotte 4, III. In: RB 95 (1988), 404–411.

PULLEYN, S.: Prayer in Greek Religion, Oxford 1997.

REIF, S.: Judaism and Hebrew Prayer. New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History, Cambridge 1993.

SANDERSON, J. E.: 4QExod[c]–4QExod[e]. In: Genesis to Numbers (Qumran Cave 4 7 = DJD 12), ed. E. ULRICH et al., Oxford 1994, 97–131.

SATLOW, M. L.: 4Q502 A New Year Festival? In: DSD 5 (1998), 57–68.

SCHOWALTER, D.: Written in Stone. A Prayer to Augustus. In: Prayer from Alexander to Constantine. A Critical Anthology, ed. M. KILEY et al., London 1997, 159–164.

SCHULLER, E. M.: Prayer at Qumran. In: Prayer from Tobit to Qumran. Inaugural Conference of the ISDCL at Salzburg, Austria, 5–9 July 2003 (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature 1), ed. R. EGGER-WENZEL et al., Berlin 2004, 411–428.

– The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-Like (with particular attention to 4Q433, 4Q433[a] and 4Q440). In: Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998. Published in memory of Maurice Baillet (StTDJ 35), ed. D. K. FALK et al., Leiden/Boston 2000, 182–193.

– Hodayot. In: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 2 (Qumran Cave 4 20 = DJD 29), ed. E. CHAZON et al., Oxford 1999, 69–254.

SKEHAN, P. W. /ULRICH, E.: 4QDeut[q]. In: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings (Qumran Cave 4 9 = DJD 14), ed. E. ULRICH et al., Oxford 1995, 137–142.

– Isaiah. In: The Prophets (Qumran Cave 4 10 = DJD 15), ed. E. ULRICH et al., Oxford 1997, 7–144.

STEGEMANN, H. /SCHULLER, E.: 1QHodayot[a]. With Incorporation of 1QHodayot[b] and 4QHodayot[a–f] (DJD 40), Oxford 2009.

STRUGNELL, J. /HARRINGTON, D. J.: Sapiental Texts. Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mûsār Lĕ Mēvîn) 4Q415ff. (Qumran Cave 4 24 = DJD 34), Oxford 1999.

TIGCHELAAR, E.: Assessing Emanuel Tov's 'Qumran Scribal Practice'. In: The Dead Sea Scrolls. Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts (StTDJ 92), ed. S. METSO, Leiden 2010, 173–205.

TOV. E.: Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Works From Qumran. In: Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected essays (TSAJ 121), Tübingen 2012, 27–41.

– Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert (StTDJ 54), Leiden 2004.

– Categorized List of the "Biblical Texts". In: The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series (DJD 39), ed. id., Oxford 2002, 165–184.

– Lists of Specific Groups of Texts from the Judaean Desert. In: The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series (DJD 39), ed. id., Oxford 2002, 203–302.

– 4QGenealogical List? (Pl. XIX). In: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea. Part 1 (Qumran Cave 4 26 = DJD 36), ed. S. PFANN et al., Oxford 2000, 290.
– Jeremiah. In: The Prophets (Qumran Cave 4 10 = DJD 15), ed. E. ULRICH et al., Oxford 1997, 145–208.
– and PFANN, S. J.: List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert. In: The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series (DJD 39), ed. id., Oxford 2002, 27–114.
WEBSTER, B.: Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert. In: The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series (DJD 39), ed. E. TOV, Oxford 2002, 351–446.
WHITE CRAWFORD, S. W. : 4QDeut^{n}–4QDeut^{p}. In: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings (Qumran Cave 4 9 = DJD 14), ed. E. ULRICH et al., Oxford 1995, 117–136.
WISE, M. O.: Accidents and Accidence. A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran. In: Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 15), Sheffield 1994, 103–151.
YADIN, Y.: Tefillin from Qumran (XQPhyl 1–4), Jerusalem 1969.
YARDENI, A.: Appendix: Documentary Texts Alleged to Be from Qumran Cave 4. In: Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Ḥever and Other Sites (DJD 27), ed. H. COTTON et al., Oxford 1997, 281–317.

Can Wisdom Be Prayer? Form and Function of the Psalms of Solomon

STEFAN SCHREIBER

The PsSol are a collection of 18 psalms or songs, each of which has its own history behind it. The literary form of the parallelismus membrorum endues these texts with the character of higher language. Their local references revolve around the city of Jerusalem, and it was there, probably, that the collection was compiled after Pompey had occupied Jerusalem in 63 B.C. or, more precisely, after Pompey's death in Egypt in 48 B.C., to which PsSol 2:26 alludes.[1] The PsSol cannot be assigned to any of the known Early Jewish sects, including the Pharisees, an attribution which could still be regarded as a matter of consensus several years ago.[2] The Greek transmission of the PsSol which we possess today can be identified as a translation, roughly dated to the 1st century A.D. from an original Hebrew text.[3] This Greek version is interesting in that it manifests the effort on the part of an Early Jewish group to read the PsSol against the backdrop of Hellenistic culture.

In the context of the topic dealt with in this volume, my main question will be whether the PsSol can be identified as prayers with a recognizable

---

[1] This date may be considered a chronological landmark in research; cf. only HOLM-NIELSEN 1977, 58f., and, more recently ATKINSON 2004, 135–139. Before that, ATKINSON had claimed to see allusions to Herod the Great in PsSol 17, thus dating it as late as the year 30 B.C.; ATKINSON 1996; id. 1998; cf. also WRIGHT 2007, 4–7.

[2] On that cf. SCHREIBER 2000, 161f.; ATKINSON 2004, 6–8; WRIGHT 2007, 7–10. In attempting to find a polemic directed specifically against Aristobulus II and his Sadducee followers in PsSol 8, ATKINSON 2003, 62–65 over-interprets the relatively unspecific statements made by the text. He himself is aware that Hyrcanus II is likewise condemned in the text (65; cf. PsSol 8:16f.).

[3] WRIGHT 2007, 7 dates the Greek translation to the beginning of the Common Era, localizing it in Egypt. Besides that, there is a Syrian version probably dependent on the Greek translation tradition. In several places, however, it may be closer to the Hebrew text than the extant Greek text. On the translations cf. HOLM-NIELSEN 1977, 53–55; WINNINGE 1995, 9–14; SCHREIBER 2000, 162; WRIGHT 2007, 11f.

liturgical (or cultic) *Sitz im Leben* or, more precisely, whether the literary form of these psalms allows us to arrive at conclusions concerning their function and concrete use. In his study on the *Historical Background and Social Setting* of the PsSol, which was published in 2004, Kenneth ATKINSON makes a clear case regarding this question,[4] with which I should like to begin.

1. A Liturgical Use of PsSol?

ATKINSON assumes that the PsSol as a collection were arranged with a certain group in view in order "to use these poems in their worship services" (2). By means of a "recitation of these poems during their worship services", this group assures itself of its own identity: The group's members comprise the faithful remnant of Israel, and their interpretation of the Torah is the correct one (2; cf. 218). Thus, according to ATKINSON the PsSol mark the beginning of a characteristic development of Jewish prayer: "The *Psalms of Solomon* should be viewed as an early example of liturgical prayers which, following the Temple's destruction in 70 CE, would become a central component of daily Jewish life" (219).

This notion of the liturgical *Sitz im Leben* of the PsSol is part of ATKINSON's overall hypothesis regarding the historical background of the group associated with them. He views the PsSol group as an anti-Sadducean sect in Jerusalem: "The writers of the Psalms abandoned the Temple cult because of their disagreement with the halakah of the priests who presided over the Temple rituals."[5] A redactor put together the collection in answer to what the group specifically perceived to be the defilement of the Temple in Jerusalem. The group ethos, which is thereby created, consists both in the rejection of the Temple cult and the parallel continuation of worship by way of everyday piety and synagogue gatherings. Ritual purity, prayer and fasting, which now effected expiation for sins, replaced the sacrificial cult of the Temple with individual synagogues in Jerusalem serving as the place for the liturgical use of the PsSol.[6]

---

[4] ATKINSON 2004; cf. also SCHÜPPHAUS 1977, 142.151–153; WRIGHT 2007, 10f.; WINNINGE 1995, 18f..

[5] ATKINSON 2004, 211–222; quotation on p. 221.

[6] Cf. ibid. 13f. Strikingly, it is from the *lack* of any mention of the Temple cult and from positive references to prayer that ATKINSON concludes the Temple cult to have been rejected and replaced by prayer and personal piety (on p. 182 about PsSol 6, also

It is an interesting question, then, by which *criteria* ATKINSON claims he can infer a liturgical use of the PsSol. I find the following patterns of reasoning in his argumentation:

(1) ATKINSON construes the συναγωγαὶ ὁσίων mentioned in PsSol 17:16 to refer to synagogue buildings in which the group behind the PsSol, the "holy ones", would gather. In his view, this congregation was a "sectarian community, meeting in their own synagogues in Jerusalem and stressing daily piety as a substitute for worship in the Temple."[7]

However, the attributive designation συναγωγαὶ *Ισραηλ* in PsSol 10:7 does not include any group-specific restriction regarding the circle of those assembled at all, and the lexeme συναγωγή may also mean the "assembly" as such (without any reference to a particular building).[8] This is made manifest by the use of the syntagma ἐκκλησία λαοῦ in 10:6 which is parallel in meaning and which clearly refers to popular assemblies. Hence, we are not given any information on the concrete use of the PsSol.

(2) ATKINSON interprets the title "the poor" which the PsSol repeatedly use to designate the praying people (5:2.11; 10:6; 15:1; 18:2) as the group's self-designated name. Inferring their physical poverty from it, he concludes that they assembled in small synagogues inside private houses (215).

However, in the prayer language of the (canonical) psalms, but also in some Qumran texts, the "poor" are identical with the "pious" who trust in God's salvific favour.[9] It is difficult, therefore, to draw conclusions concerning concrete social circumstances.

(3) The redactor put PsSol 1 at the beginning of the whole collection by way of introduction to facilitate the reading of these psalms in the synagogue. The topic of justice in the face of military menace, which is central to the collection, was thereby introduced (205f.). This would, however, also hold true regardless of the context of synagogal reading.

(4) ATKINSON concludes from the structure of the collection – and here he refers to the five-part compositional scheme suggested by P. N. FRANK-

---

pointing to PsSol 3:3; 5:1; 7:6f. ; cf. 191.195). That Early Jewish groups *outside* Jerusalem introduced regular daily times of prayer as a replacement for the locally distant Temple cult has been established by ESHEL 1999, 334.

[7] ATKINSON 2004, 213f., quotation 214; cf. 200f.

[8] It is translated in this way ("Versammlung") in: KRAUS/KARRER 2009, 924.929. FALK 2001, 36, observes that "there is as yet no certain evidence that there was a regular and substantial prayer liturgy in synagogues by this time."

[9] E.g. Ps 9:19; 25:9; 34:3; 113:7f. ; 1QH 13:22; 1QM 11:9.13. On that cf. WOLTER 2008, 248f.

LYN, which is designed to show a thematic development – that the redaction was meant to support public readings during the service.[10] The whole collection, he argues, may be recited in Greek within 55 minutes.[11] The PsSol are to be understood as part of a regular daily practice of prayer.

In any case, this remains a claim only. I suppose it is the literary form of higher language used in the PsSol which provides the tacitly-assumed basis for the assumption that these texts may have served as public prayers in services. The question remains whether observations on the literary form of the collection allow us to draw conclusions regarding a concrete *Sitz im Leben*.

2. Superscripts in the PsSol

With the exception of the first text, in the Greek transmission the PsSol are all furnished with a superscript. Giving them a unitary, characteristic shape, these superscripts are important for the outward character of the collection as a whole. Hence, it is likely that these superscripts were added only in the course of the redaction of the collection (probably already in the Hebrew version).[12] They contain the following elements: an unitary pseudepigraphic attribution of the texts to Solomon, extrapolations of a central thought from the texts (partly by incorporating certain keywords) and details on the literary form of the texts:

(1) With one exception,[13] the attribution to Solomon in PsSol 2–18 has the formula τῷ Σαλωμων. The dative which appears odd in Greek is best explained as a translation of the Hebrew preposition ל, as it is also used in the titles of the canonical psalms: *l*^{e}*dāwid*. It can either have a modal ("with regard to", "concerning") or a causal meaning (as *l*^{e} *auctoris*: "by").[14] In this way, the recipients are provided with the background of understanding that informs the collection: It is to be read and interpreted as

[10] ATKINSON 2004, 219. FRANKLYN 1987, 1–17: individual (PsSol 3–6; 12–16) and national (2; 7–11; 17–18a) psalms, with introduction (1) and benediction (18b).

[11] With reference to FRANKLYN 1987, 5.

[12] Cf. HOLM-NIELSEN 1997, 58. In contrast, SCHÜPPHAUS 1977, 151–153 attributes the superscripts to another phase of revision, which, in his view, was carried out with regard to the liturgical use.

[13] PsSol 4 is titled διαλογὴ τοῦ Σαλωμων – speech of Solomon.

[14] JENNI ^{2}1981, 294f.

part of the sapiential Solomon tradition.[15] First Kings 5:9–11 praises Solomon as the wisest human being, his wisdom being given by God, and 5:12 knows of 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs that Solomon composed. As a poet, Solomon may well be on a par with David. The pseudepigraphic Solomon attribution of the *Wisdom of Solomon* and the Gnostically-influenced *Odes of Solomon* testify to his early Jewish prominence as a founding figure of the wisdom tradition.[16]

(2) The designations "psalm" (ψαλμός), "hymn" (ὕμνος) and "song" (ᾠδή), which are found as superscripts of several PsSol,[17] may at first sight be read as technical musical hints that point to the practical performance of the PsSol with song and music.[18] A comparison with the headlines of the canonical psalms, however, reveals these designations to be part of a fixed repertory of psalm descriptions.[19] And it is already true in the case of the canonical psalms that the designation "psalm" (Hebrew *mizmōr*) permits no conclusions regarding a possible practical performance. Thus, Erich ZENGER, in his *Introduction* to the *Book of Psalms*, points out: "It is questionable, however, whether this may be viewed as testimony of the way of recitation of these texts in biblical time", since, in the course of the "Davidization" of the Psalter, this constitutes an allusion to David as a lyre

---

[15] There is perhaps a connecting line running from the canonical Psalter to the Solomon pseudepigraphy of the PsSol, for Ps 72 is already identified as a Solomon Psalm by its superscript. In terms of contents, it bears striking resemblance to PsSol 17 in that God's appointed king exercises justice particularly for the poor in Israel.

[16] Cf. LATTKE 2004, 805–809. The whole of the Book of Proverbs is also attributed to Solomon in the Septuagint (Prov 1:1).

[17] "Psalm": PsSol 2.3.5.13.15.17.18; "hymn": PsSol 10.14.16 (10: "among hymns"); "with a song": PsSol 15.17.

[18] This is an argument advanced by SCHÜPPHAUS 1977, 151f.

[19] Some examples: The term "psalm" is used in the superscripts of Ps 3–6.8.9.12.13 and others, "hymn" by Ps 6.53.54.60 LXX and in several others (= "with string music" Ps 6.54.55.61 MT), "song" in Ps 4.17.38 LXX and in several others as well (Ps 4 MT "with string music", 18 MT "song"). It is a matter of dispute how far it is appropriate to speak of "poetry" in this context: According to the Greek and Roman notion, meter is an indispensable feature of poetry. It is lacking in the PsSol, however. The *parallelismus membrorum* in Hebrew texts is not restricted to the Psalms or other texts which we would probably categorize as poetical. The Greek early Jewish reception, at least as it becomes apparent for us with Josephus, Antiquitates 7:305 and possibly Philo, *vita contemplativa* 3.10.29f.80, assigns the Psalms to the poetic genre, which is probably part of the process of assimilation to Greek culture. An open terminology which tries to do justice to the notion of the first century may speak of "higher language". On the problem cf. BRUCKER 1997, 23–35.

player (1 Sam 16:14–23; 18:10).[20] Thus, the analogous designations of the PsSol are aimed at an *imitation* of the *Book of Psalms*: Instead of providing concrete directives for their recitation, they are rather meant as guidance for their reception.

The same function is likely to be fulfilled by the two διάψαλμα notes in PsSol 17:29 and 18:9, which mirror the Hebrew *sela* known from the Psalms and which correspond to the Septuagint version. In addition, they are used for the purpose of structure and reader guidance.[21]

(3) The descriptions of the respective topic, which are part of many superscripts, are intended to guide the reading in terms of contents. They too may be seen as imitations of the Psalms. Regardless of how accurately these descriptions capture the contents of the corresponding texts, they, as a whole, provide a survey of the thematic spectrum of the PsSol: concerning Jerusalem (PsSol 2), concerning the righteous (3), concerning the men-pleasers (4), in hope (6), of turning back (7), into the battle (8), for rebuke (9), unto expectation (11), concerning the tongue of transgressors (12), comfort for the righteous (13), for help to the pious (16), of the king (17), again of the Anointed of the Lord (18).

In a nutshell, the information given in the superscripts tells us a lot about the cultural background of the collection – sapiential tradition, imitations of the Psalms – but nothing about a liturgical or musical use.

3. The literary forms of the PsSol

In terms of form criticism, the assumption that the PsSol also imitate the canonical psalms in their outward appearance is supported by the observation that PsSol 1, exactly like Ps 1, begins without a superscript. If we look at the literary form of the PsSol on the basis of the main genres of the canonical psalms,[22] we see that all the 18 texts may be assigned to one of those genres. However, in doing so, we must allow for the dissolution of strict literary schemes and the regular overlapping of literary forms. This is certainly due to the fact that an originally cultic *Sitz im Leben* is already lacking for most of the psalms. It is particularly striking that elements of

[20] ZENGER [6]2006, 350.

[21] This is quite obvious in PsSol 18:9, as the verses 10–12 constitute a case of praise of God that, concluding the whole collection, transcends the actual topic.

[22] A survey is given by ZENGER [6]2006, 360–362.

wisdom psalms like macarisms or typifying reflections on the success or failure of life are constantly being mixed with other genre schemes.

Thus, PsSol 1 starts as a psalm of lamentation ("I cried unto the Lord when I was in utter distress, unto God when the sinners assailed"; 1:1). However, from v. 3 it turns into a more sapiential reflection upon the current situation of the praying "I". It is the city of Jerusalem itself which gives a summary of its children being lost in sin, arrogance and impiety.

On account of this mixture of formal elements of different genres, exact attributions may well be debatable. The rest of the collection may tentatively be categorized as follows:[23]

[23] Other attempts, which in my view neglect the sapiential character, are given by HOLM-NIELSEN 1977, 55f.: psalms of lamentation 4.5.7.8.9.12.17, psalms of gratitude 2.13.15.16, hymns 3.6.10.11.14.18; SCHÜPPHAUS 1977, 76–78: past, present and future of the pious 3.6.10.13.14.15.16, historical and social references 1/2.8.17 and 4.7.12(.11), summary 18, praise and plea 5.9; NICKELSBURG 1981, 202–212: psalms of the nation 1.2.7.8.11.17.18, psalms of the righteous and pious 3.4.6.9.10.13.14.15.16; cf. also n. 10. On the influence that the language of early Jewish penitential prayers exerted on the PsSol cf. WERLINE 1998, 109–159; FALK 2001, 40f.

2 a supplicatory psalm of an individual 2:1–25; a psalm of praise 2:26–37
3 psalm of praise, which, starting with v. 4, has traits of a wisdom psalm (juxtaposition: the righteous one and the sinner)
4 a supplicatory/lamentory psalm, culminating in the expression of trust 4:23–25; strongly sapiential traits (characterization of the sinner; "Blessed…" 4:23)
5 psalm of praise 5:1–4.19; supplicatory psalm 5:5–8; wisdom psalm 5:9–18 (there is a proverb in 5:13; "Blessed…" 5:16)
6 a wisdom psalm (it begins with "Blessed is the man…" 6:1; an element of a psalm of praise in 6:6); a collective supplicatory psalm
7 a psalm of the people's lament: depiction of distress 8:1–23, praise 8:24–26, plea 8:27–30, trust 8:31–33, praise 8:34
8 wisdom psalm (with plea 9:8 and trust 9:9–11)
9 wisdom psalm 10:1–4; psalm of praise 10:5–8 (it begins with "Blessed…" 10:1)
10 Zion psalm (it celebrates God at Zion/in Jerusalem with eschatological exultation)
11 supplicatory psalm
12 psalm of gratitude with sapiential elements in 13:7–11
sapiential/didactic psalm
13 psalm of gratitude and praise 15:1–3; wisdom psalm 15:4–13
14 psalm of gratitude 16:1–5; psalm of plea 16:6–15
supplicatory psalm with a hymnic opening (17:1–3) and sapiential semantics (17:23.29.32.35.37; "Blessed…" 17:44)[24]
15 psalm of praise with sapiential elements in 18:6–9 ("Blessed…" 18:6)

As a matter of fact, the collection of the PsSol may be understood as sapiential texts with the literary form of the "classical" Psalms serving as their outward attire. These literary forms were used to ensure the connection with the tradition of Israel, as it is embodied in the prominent corpus of the *Psalms*. In doing so, an identity of Israel rooted in old tradition is evoked. Hence, what Erich ZENGER points out with regard to the wisdom psalms of the *Tanach* equally holds true for the function of the PsSol as well: "Strictly speaking, they are not prayers, but reflections and meditations on the success of life, on the fate of the good and the evil, on creation and the Law."[25] And Otto KAISER concludes from the mixture of

---

[24] It is very difficult to determine the literary form of PsSol 17. HOLM-NIELSEN 1977, 56, views it as a song of lament; cf. POMYKALA 1995, 160; SCHREIBER 2000, 163. WASCHKE 2001, 138, speaks of a "literary mixture of hymn, lament and plea". On sapiential elements in PsSol 17 cf. REITERER 2007, 238–240.

[25] ZENGER ^{6}2006, 362.

genres "that these songs, in the strict sense, are not prayers, but didactic poems. They address a readership who entrust themselves to its guidance, who, after re-reading it again and again, see through their inner coherence and who, then, meditating and praying, read it for the sake of their edification."[26] The literary form of a psalm thus aims at personal reception and adoption. A fine case in point is provided by the wisdom psalm 6, which says with regard to the blessed man:

> (4) He arises from his sleep, and blesses the name of the Lord: When his heart is constant, he sings to the name of his God, (5) and he entreats the Lord for all his house. And the Lord hears the prayer of every one that fears God. (6) And every supplication of a soul setting her hopes on him is fulfilled by the Lord.

Praise and supplication are recommended with insistence without the psalm being constructed as a precast prayer itself. The mere form of a psalm is no indication of a liturgical *Sitz im Leben*.[27] It still remains now to inquire into the inner cohesion mentioned by KAISER.

4. The Structure of the Collection

Besides a few formal structuring signals, my compositional schema is mainly directed by thematic aspects. Thus I end up with a three-part structure framed by PsSol 1 as a prooemium and PsSol 18 as an epilogue. The three main parts have a numerical ratio of seven, two and again seven psalms. Parts one and three are each enclosed by two framing texts.

---

[26] KAISER 2004, 363.

[27] The non-canonical psalms found among the Dead Sea Scrolls give no hints of a liturgical usage (11QPs[a]; 4Q371–372; 4Q378–379; 4Q380–381); the *Sitz im Leben* remains unclear. This becomes apparent in comparison with prayers and blessings whose intention of divine worship is explicitly stated in their headings and rubrics – for festivals and other ceremonies. Cf. NITZAN 1994, 8–22, who gives some characteristics of those Qumran texts which were intended for prayer (20f.); cf. her overview of fixed prayers in id. 1994, 47–87.

PsSol 1	Prooemium: Jerusalem's lament	
2–8	Part One: Historical Background	
	2.8	Frame: the history of the Roman invasion 63 B.C. – situation and demonstration of God's justice[28]
	3–7	The life of the righteous and the sinners in this historical situation 3 the attitude of the righteous and the sinners (in the face of divine education) 4 warning against lawless hypocrites and plea for liberation from them 5 trust in God's justice and goodness 6 trust in prayer 7 plea for help against enemies/Gentiles
9–10	Part Two: God's *paideia*	
	9	The exile as a model: God's action in judgement – ending in love and mercy
	10	Education by God, orientation and guidance: the Abrahamic covenant und the Torah[29]
11–17	Part Three: eschatological foresight	
	11.17	Frame: the eschatological restitution of Zion (11); the Messiah's kingdom (17)[30]
	12–16	Confrontation of the righteous and the sinners in an eschatological light 12 calumniation 13 castigation/trust 14 commandments/law for life 15 trust in God 16 plea for rescue and strengthening (involving castigation)
18	Epilogue: summary – God's eternal mercy and concluding praise – the cosmic scope of God's power	

This structure of the collection becomes manifest only by intensive studies and reflections.[31] It points to a *Sitz im Leben* in circles who either

[28] Formal signal: In PsSol 8, there is a concluding praise consisting of two lines, whereas there is but one line in the preceding texts.

[29] Formal: a long concluding praise in PsSol 10:5–8. On the exile and the covenant as the theological centre of the PsSol cf. also STEINS 2006, 136f.

[30] Formal: 17:46 inclusion with 17:1 (topic: God as the king). Everything is brought full circle before the epilogue. The reign of the Messiah serves as a contrast to the apostasy of Israel under Roman rule.

individually or as a community were devoted to the study of the scriptures. Hence, it is highly unlikely that the collection of the PsSol was intended as a "book of songs and prayers" for the worship services of an early Jewish community.

5. Conclusions: The *Sitz im Leben* of PsSol

The formal shape of the PsSol does not provide any hint of a cultic or liturgical use of these "songs". It is certainly true that more elevated language is used in imitation of the canonical psalms, and as regards the potential ways of reception, this basic insight into their literary form and its history entails a comparatively high number of possible applications: A whole bunch of different meanings are offered, and the possibilities of choosing from thoughts that are either attractive or disturbing are numerous. Neither, in terms of content, do the PsSol provide any hints to the cultic *Sitz im Leben*. In comparison to numerous prayers originating in Roman culture this becomes apparent, as the latter explain the cultic actions that form their concrete context of application. In the context of the power of words, Pliny the Elder (*naturalis historia* 28:10) would say: "a sacrifice without prayer is thought to be useless and not a proper consultation of the gods".[32] The right performance of the sacrifice is at stake. A petitionary prayer, transmitted by Cato the Elder (*de agri cultura* 141), may serve as an example of a prayer explaining the sacrifice:

Father Mars, I pray and beseech you to be favorable and propitious toward me and my family and household; wherefore I have ordered this sacrifice of a pig, sheep, and bull to be led around my farm, land, and estate, so that you may prohibit, avert, and ward off diseases seen and unseen, barrenness and devastation, destruction and intemperate weather, so that you may permit the produce, grains, vines, and bushes to grow large and flourish, that you may keep safe the shepherds and sheep, and that you may grant health and wellness to me, my family, and household; wherefore, for the purpose of purifying and making pure my estate, land and farm, as I have spoken, be honored with the

---

[31] Other suggestions concerning the structure are offered by KAISER 2004, 364–367; STEINS 2006, 124–127.

[32] Quoted by HICKSON HAHN 2007, 235–248, quotation 235; later, with regard to Pliny the Elder, she puts it more sharply, elaborating: "Without words of prayer to identify the purpose of rituals, neither the divine recipients nor the human audience could understand what was happening" (247); on a variety of ritual contexts cf. 237–239. Some biblical examples of prayers, psalms etc. accompanying sacrifices are given by NITZAN 1994, 37f.

sacrifice of this suckling pig, sheep, and bull. Father Mars, for this purpose, be honored with the sacrifice of this suckling pig, sheep, and bull.

The PsSol never identifiy such ritual actions.

Hence, while reading the PsSol (as well as other texts of Early Judaism and Christianity which are composed in more elevated language), we have to take into serious consideration the phenomenon of traditional forms being imitated in literary contexts.[33] In these cases, such imitation does not point to a concrete liturgical *Sitz im Leben*, but to the poetical intention of evoking ways of reception and contexts of tradition in order to remind the readers that they are members of a virtual community with *the* faithful, reliable, and binding tradition of Israel.

These reflections on the form of the PsSol, however, can at least give first hints to a concrete *Sitz im Leben* of the corpus. The sapiential character of the collection, which is made apparent by the Solomon attribution and the formative elements of wisdom psalms, and the imitation of the psalms point to a group identifiable in terms of social history: What already holds true for the canonical Psalms[34] and the Early Jewish wisdom literature in general, holds true for the PsSol as well. They were probably read, studied, and passed on in sapiential, scribal circles by way of teachings, reflections, and meditations. The aimed-at reception in both meditation and prayer mirrors those circles' search for a new "inwardness" of a life led in accordance with the traditions of Israel.

These details may be supplemented and expanded by observations on the contents.

(1) The PsSol evince a certain distance *vis-à-vis* the Temple. The Temple is deprived of its significance as the means of the purgation of sins, as the PsSol do not expect any salvation from the Temple. This is substantiated by the fact that the Temple as the place of JHWH's praise (PsSol 3:3; 5:1; 6:1.4f. ; 7:7) or the place where God's name dwells (7:6) is not even mentioned. Likewise, the Temple is absent in the "salvation programme" of 9:8–11[35] (mention is made of God's people, Abraham,

---

[33] The Qumran texts mirror a copious production of prayers, hymns etc. which, at least partly, are imitations of the biblical Psalms; cf. NITZAN 1994, 10.17f. The existence of a collection like the PsSol is therefore not surprising.

[34] ZENGER ^{6}2006, 359f., opts against the assumption that the canonical Book of Psalms was composed as a "book of prayer and song for the synagogal liturgy"; ibid. 367, he refers to the milieu of the wisdom schools as the place of the reception of the Psalms.

[35] On this cf. FALK 2001, 41f.; STEINS 2006, 134.

God's name, the covenant with the Fathers, repentance, God's mercy). The praying persons attain purgation of non-intentional sins by means of fasting and self-humiliation (e.g. 3:8) rather than Temple sacrifices, as they are laid down in Lev 4.[36] This is due to the defilement of the Temple decried by the PsSol (1:6–8; 2:2–5; 8:11f.22 and also 17:30), which, all in all, is the consequence of the personal failure of the priesthood and which impinges upon the effectiveness of the sacrificial cult.[37] From a sociological point of view, the literary distance *vis-à-vis* the Temple is probably occasioned by the historical distance of the group *vis-à-vis* the high priestly Temple elite. The polemic against the Temple elite points to a group-specific rather than a "public" use of the PsSol.

(2) As we have seen, it is the practice of fasting that functions as the means of cleansing.[38] A constant, daily custom of prayer also receives frequent mention as an ideal of the everyday practice of religion (3:1–3; 5:1; 6:1f.4–6; 7:7; 15:1.3; 16:5).[39] While the PsSol do not offer any standardized prayer formula, this does not by any means rule out a practice of prayer that is meant to be inspired by the PsSol: Texts like the appreciation of prayer in PsSol 6, the intense plea in 8:27–30 or the expression of trust in 8:31–33 are indeed invitations to a personal shaping of a practice of prayer. These forms of religious practice are independent of the Temple and serve personal piety.

(3) The PsSol perceive the socio-political situation as a challenge (e.g. 5:5.7–17). When they address the suffering of the righteous one, they evidence their reception of the sapientially-imbued tradition of the suffering righteous one (cf. Ps 22; Wisd 2:12–20; 5:1–8).

(4) The group identifications built up within the text are telling. The righteous are juxtaposed with the sinners from Israel's own ranks and the Gentiles, who are likewise viewed as sinners (e.g. PsSol 2:34–36; 3:3–7.9–11). In social reality, there was apparently a confrontation between two different lifestyles, though it is impossible to identify the

---

[36] On that cf. ATKINSON 2004, 215f., who concludes, however, that there was a "distinctive sectarian community" behind it (195). The silence of the PsSol regarding the Temple cult and their criticism of its priesthood need not be interpreted as a total separation from the Temple; cf. the criticism by EMBRY 2002, 129f. cf. 121.133; FALK 2001, 49f.

[37] A comparison with the Qumran group is conducted by ATKINSON 2004, 212f.

[38] Cf. ATKINSON 2004, 195 again in comparison with the Qumran writings.

[39] HORBURY 2007, 119–125 recognizes "a practice of prayer and psalmody thought of as continuous" within the framework of a "system of piety" (124) in the background of the PsSol. Cf. already VITEAU 1911, 335.

antagonistic groups with certain socio-religious parties in Early Judaism.[40] I attempt to interpret this from a socio-historical perspective.

Kenneth ATKINSON, whom I mentioned at the beginning, thought of an underprivileged Jewish sect in Jerusalem that had distanced itself from the Temple and that, in fact, addressed its own theodicy question in the PsSol.[41] Inspired by the analogy with the Qumran scriptures, he reconstructs the attitude of this sect as based on criticism of the Temple and its defilement by the hands of the ruling high priests. The difference is that this group continues to stay in Jerusalem, establishing its own liturgical service there. In my opinion, ATKINSON pays only insufficient attention to the confrontation with the Gentiles, which becomes apparent in the PsSol, i.e. the confrontation with the Hellenistic culture that had gained strength in Israel following the Roman occupation. Nor does the sapiential character of PsSol play any role in his reconstruction.

In my opinion, the fact that the texts, strikingly, do not set any exclusive inner-Jewish boundary markers at all contradicts the attempt to attribute the PsSol to an Early Jewish sect. The history of the Roman invasion, as it is characterized in PsSol 2 and 8, concerns *all* the Jews in the country, and the same holds true for the expectations in the *eschaton* (11.17). Likewise, the exile that serves as a model for God's educative actions and the orientation towards the covenant and the Torah (9.10) encompasses the *whole* of Israel. By that, the theology of the PsSol is firmly anchored in the tradition of Israel. However, the authors of the PsSol cannot but see that not everyone in Israel sincerely searches for and follows the way of JHWH (cf. only PsSol 1). It is not visible at first sight who lives "righteously". Thus, there are group boundaries between the groups behind the PsSol and other Jerusalem groups after all, though they are not recognizable at first sight.[42] The sinners, while appearing to be righteous (1:2f.; 8:6), commit sins in secret (1:7; 4:5; 8:9); they "sit in the council of the pious" (4:1) and seem to be successful in fulfilling the commandments of the Torah (4:2f.7f.), i.e. they held a high social status and public authority. Hence results the prayer's wish that God may uncover the sinner's true identify in

---

[40] SANDERS 1977, 403–414; cf. FALK 2001, 45.

[41] ATKINSON 2004, 220–222; id. 2003, 546–575. Contrary to ATKINSON, SCHRÖTER 1998, 570–572 points out that the line between one's own group and the whole of Israel is drawn far more clearly in the pertinent Qumran texts than in the PsSol.

[42] On this cf. FALK 2001, 45.48. In a different fashion, WINNINGE 1995, 125–136 distinguishes between sinners, the sinfully righteous and the righteous (i.e. the Messiah and God).

judgement (2:17f.; 4:6–8). Thus, it is all the more important to recall Israel's genuine identity. What should, in fact, hold true for the whole of Israel is at least to be realized in an outstanding way by the "righteous one" as the role model of the group behind the PsSol. The life of Israel assumes a recognizable shape in the life of the righteous one.[43] This also accounts for the fact that the texts, besides the whole of Israel (e.g. 10:7f.; 11:7–9; 12:6), also look at the *house* as the place for the community of the righteous one's life (3:6–8; 12:5)[44] – the place where the righteous do those very things that constitute the identity of the PsSol: fasting, acceptance of the negative experience of the situation as God's castigation, reflection and prayer as an expression of a new inwardness.

My argument is that the PsSol fit in conservative, sapiential, and scribal circles in Jerusalem taking issue with Hellenistic culture. Sapiential circles principally maintained "a certain distance *vis-à-vis* the Temple aristocracy and its Hellenizing tendencies."[45] In the time of the Roman reign, this Temple elite managed to find a *modus vivendi* with the political rulers.[46] This provoked the formation of opposition movements. The PsSol strive to oppose the undeniable attraction of Hellenistic and Roman culture by reinforcing the tradition of Israel and encouraging their own ethos to be guided by this tradition, as it is encapsulated in the Torah. The sapientially-shaped juxtaposition of the role models of the "righteous one" and the "sinner", as it is to be found throughout the whole of the PsSol,[47] exhibits this dividing line between two different cultural guiding paradigms. After all, not only does the term "sinners" refer to Gentiles, but also to the Jews who open themselves to the influence of Roman and Hellenistic culture, thereby risking the undermining of their own identity from within. It is telling that the Jewish "sinners" are subject to the same

---

[43] Incidentally, in PsSol 16:7f., which warns the praying person against an evil and lawless woman and her beauty, it becomes quite clear that the texts are informed by an androcentric perspective.

[44] 4 Macc 18:10–19 sheds some light on the transmission of Israel's scriptures und the traditions that they contain.

[45] ZENGER ^{6}2006, 367.

[46] Thus, the High Priest Hyrcanus II was made a "Friend of Rome" under Caesar, cf. SASSE 2004, 240. On the collaboration of Sadducees and Roman governors in Judea, cf. EBNER ^{2}2004, 64–67.

[47] The contrast between the righteous and the sinners is sapiential in character; cf. STEINS 2006, 138f. FALK 2001, 39–49 delineates in what ways the PsSol draw a line between their own group and the others, recognizing the rhetorical function "to reinforce sharp group boundaries" (43).

charges as the "Gentiles" – they behave "arrogantly", they are "sinners", and they have defiled the Temple.[48] Against this background, there is one distinction that the sapiential group behind the PsSol finds imperative and urgent, namely the recognition of what is, in fact, a "sinner", i.e. one who adapts to Hellenistic culture,[49] and the rejection of this process of assimilation. PsSol 3, for instance, seeks to heighten caution *vis-à-vis* foreign influence by virtue of a practice of fasting. At the same time, it is crucial to give meaning to the inevitable disadvantages incurred by such a life of unrelenting Jewish conviction. The PsSol use the idea of the "castigation" or education that God employs to guide his own people towards a deeper comprehension of his salvific plan. In terms of social history, it is very likely that conservative circles in Jerusalem, who had in reality distanced themselves from the community of the Temple cult, indeed experienced severe economic disadvantages.[50]

Hence, the PsSol do not stand for an exclusive sect, but for a movement among the educated circles of Jerusalem (and beyond) that had distanced itself from the Temple elite, but advocated a determined commitment to the traditional ethos of the Jewish people.

Bibliography

ATKINSON, K.: I Cried to the Lord. A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting (JSJ.S 84), Leiden 2004.
– Theodicy in the Psalms of Solomon. In: Theodicy in the World of the Bible, ed. A. LAATO/J. C. DE MOOR, Leiden 2003, 546–575.
– 4QMMT and Psalm of Solomon 8. Two Anti-Sadducean Documents. In: The Qumran Chronicle 11 (2003), 57–77.
– Toward a Redating of the Psalms of Solomon. Implications for Understanding the Sitz im Leben of an Unknown Jewish Sect. In: JSPE 17 (1998), 95–112.
– Herod the Great, Sosius, and the Siege of Jerusalem (37 B.C.E.) in Psalm of Solomon 17. In: NT 38 (1996), 313–322.

[48] PsSol 1:5–8; 2:3.9.12; 4:5; 8:9.12f.22; 17:6.15. Cf. FALK 2001, 44.

[49] Cf. only the *alleged* justice of Jerusalem in PsSol 1 and the comparison of the "sinners" with the "Gentiles" (1:8; cf. 8:13). "Transgressors" (4:23; 12), "uncleanness" (8:22) and "lawlessness" (e.g. 15:8.10) point to a divergence from the tradition of Israel. This is pointed out with great clarity in PsSol 17:14f.

[50] This might be the background of notions like "the poor", "the needy", "the humble" (5:11f.). On that cf. WERLINE 2006, 78.85 (with reference to PsSol 4:9–13.20–22; 5:1–5). WERLINE himself thinks of "a group of scribal retainers" who had lost their power and social position under these political circumstances (82.85).

BRUCKER, R.: "Christushymnen" oder "epideiktische Passagen"? Studien zum Stilwechsel im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt (FRLANT 176), Göttingen 1997.

EBNER, M.: Jesus von Nazaret in seiner Zeit. Sozialgeschichtliche Zugänge (SBS 196), Stuttgart [2]2004.

EMBRY, B.: The Psalms of Solomon and the New Testament. In: JSP 13 (2002), 99–136.

ESHEL, E.: Prayer in Qumran and the Synagogue. In: Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kultes im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum (WUNT 118), ed. B. EGO et al., Tübingen 1999, 323–334.

FALK, D.: Psalms and Prayers. In: Justification and Variegated Nomism I (WUNT II/140), ed. D. A. CARSON et al., Tübingen 2001, 7–56.

FRANKLYN, P. N.: The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon. In: JSJ 18 (1987), 1–17.

HICKSON HAHN, F.: Performing the Sacred: Prayers and Hymns. In: A Companion to Roman Religion, ed. J. RÜPKE, London 2007, 235–248.

HOLM-NIELSEN, S.: Die Psalmen Salomos (JSHRZ IV/2), Gütersloh 1977.

HORBURY, W.: The Remembrance of God in the *Psalms of Solomon*. In: Memory in the Bible and Antiquity (WUNT 212), ed. S. C. BARTON, Tübingen 2007, 111–128.

JENNI, E.: Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments, Basel/Frankfurt a.M. [2]1981.

KAISER, O.: Beobachtungen zur Komposition und Redaktion der Psalmen Salomos. In: Das Manna fällt auch heute noch. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments (Festschrift E. Zenger; HBS 44), ed. F. L. HOSSFELD et al., Freiburg i.Br. 2004, 362–378.

KRAUS, W. et al.: Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung, Stuttgart 2009.

LATTKE, M.: Salomoschriften I.-III. In: RGG[4] 7 (2004), 805–809.

NICKELSBURG, G. W. E. : Jewish Literature Between the Bible and Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction, Philadelphia 1981.

NITZAN, B.: Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry (STDJ 12), Leiden 1994.

POMYKALA, K. E.: The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism. Its History and Significance for Messianism (SBL.EJL 7), Atlanta 1995.

REITERER, F. V.: Aspekte der Messianologie der Septuaginta. Der Weisheit Beitrag zur Entwicklung messianischer Vorstellungen. In: Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Vol. 3 (BWANT 174), ed. H.-J. FABRY et al., Stuttgart 2007, 226–244.

SANDERS, E. P.: Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion, Philadelphia 1977.

SASSE, M.: Geschichte Israels in der Zeit des zweiten Tempels. Historische Ereignisse, Archäologie, Sozialgeschichte, Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2004.

SCHREIBER, S.: Gesalbter und König. Titel und Konzeptionen der königlichen Gesalbtenerwartung in frühjüdischen und urchristlichen Schriften (BZNW 105), Berlin/New York 2000.

SCHRÖTER, J.: Gerechtigkeit und Barmherzigkeit. Das Gottesbild der Psalmen Salomos in seinem Verhältnis zu Qumran und Paulus. In: NTS 44 (1998), 557–577.

SCHÜPPHAUS, J.: Die Psalmen Salomos. Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts (ALGHJ 7), Leiden 1977.

STEINS, G.: Die Psalmen Salomos – ein Oratorium über die Barmherzigkeit Gottes und die Rettung Jerusalems. In: Laetare Jerusalem. Festschrift zum 100jährigen

Ankommen der Benediktinermönche auf dem Jerusalemer Zionsberg (JThF 10), ed. N. C. SCHNABEL, Münster 2006, 121–141.
VITEAU, J.: Les Psaumes de Salomon. Introduction, texte grec et traduction, Paris 1911.
WASCHKE, E.-J.: "Richte ihnen auf ihren König, den Sohn Davids" – Psalmen Salomos 17 und die Frage nach den messianischen Traditionen. In: Der Gesalbte. Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie (BZAW 306), ed. id., Berlin/New York 2001, 127–140.
WERLINE, R. A.: Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism. The Development of a Religious Institution (SBL.EJL 13), Atlanta 1998.
– The *Psalms of Solomon* and the Ideology of Rule. In: Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism (SBL.SS 35), ed. B. G. WRIGHT et al., Leiden 2006, 69–87.
WINNINGE, M.: Sinners and the Righteous. A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters (CB.NT 26), Stockholm 1995.
WOLTER, M.: Das Lukasevangelium (HNT 5), Tübingen 2008.
WRIGHT, R. B.: The Psalms of Solomon. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 1), London/New York 2007.
ZENGER, E.: Das Buch der Psalmen. In: Einleitung in das Alte Testament (KStTh 1,1), ed. id. et al., Stuttgart [6]2006, 348–370.

Fundamentals of the Study of Piyyut

MICHAEL RAND

1. Definition

The liturgical poetry of the synagogue is called *piyyut* (פיוט), a word that is a Hebraized derivative of Greek ποιητής "poet." The fact that a foreign term was employed for referring to this phenomenon, though a number of native terms for poetry derived from the biblical lexicon were available (שיר, זמרה, etc.) appears to indicate that it was felt to be meaningfully distinct, in form as well as in function, from biblical psalmody. Modern research has amply confirmed this distinction. From the fact that *piyyut* is liturgical poetry may be derived two of its fundamental properties: 1) it is religious poetry by nature, and 2) it has no independent existence outside of the synagogue liturgy (and in certain cases, extra-synagogal liturgy, such as that of the table). In order to understand the forms and functions of *piyyut*, therefore, we must first establish a number of fundamental, relevant facts about Jewish liturgical practice.

2. Jewish Liturgy

Jewish liturgical time is basically dichotomous: any given day is either profane (חול) or sacred (קודש), though certain occasions, i.e., the New Moon (ראש חודש), the intermediate days of festivals, Purim and Hanukkah simultaneously partake of both qualities. For ritual purposes, the day runs from evening to evening. The profane day encompasses three statutory prayer-occasions: the Evening service (ערבית), the Morning service (שחרית), and the Afternoon service (מנחה). On a sacred day, i.e., a Sabbath or a holiday, two elements are added to this protocol, between the Morning and Afternoon services: 1) a Torah lection accompanied by a reading from the Prophets (הפטרה), which is followed by 2) the Additional service

(מוסף).[1] The prayer-occasions are explicitly conceptualized as being one-for-one replacements for the sacrificial rituals of the Temple. The reading of Scripture, on the other hand, despite the fact that it is attested – albeit rarely and marginally – within the context of the Temple cult, is more properly a ritual of the synagogue.

Two major cycles run in tandem within the Jewish liturgical calendar: 1) the festival cycle, and 2) the cycle of Scriptural lections. The festival cycle includes: 1) the three pilgrimage feasts (שלושה רגלים): Passover, Shavuot (Pentecost) and Sukkot/Shemini Atzeret, 2) the two High Holidays (ימים נוראים): Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur, 3) the semi-feasts of Purim and Hanukka, and 4) fast days, also semi-sacred, the most important of which from the liturgical point of view are the Seventeenth of Tammuz and the Ninth of Av. The festival cycle furthermore subsumes the alternation between the seasons of Rain (from the Additional service of the first day of Passover until the Morning service of Shemini Atzeret) and Dew (from the Additional service of Shemini Atzeret until the Morning service of Passover). The occasions making up the festival cycle are interlaced by special Sabbaths, during which either particular Torah lections or particular Prophetic lections are read outside of the regular cycle of Scriptural lections. The pilgrimage feasts, the High Holidays, and Hanukkah all have associated Scriptural lections. On Purim and on the Ninth of Av, on the other hand, biblical Scrolls (sing. מגילה) are read: Esther on Purim and Lamentations on the Ninth of Av. The festival cycle is strictly tied to the Jewish lunar calendar and begins in the month of Nisan with Passover. For this reason, it is effectively subsumed within the cycle of New Moons.

The cycle of Scriptural lections follows the order of the text of the Torah, beginning with Genesis and ending with Deuteronomy. At present, all Jewish liturgical rites employ a division of the Torah into a number of portions (sing. פרשה) that allows the cycle to be completed within one year. All the portions are read on consecutive Sabbaths, with the exception of the last one, which is read with special ceremony on the festival of Simhat Torah.[2] This yearly cycle is rooted in the practice of the communities of Babylon. However, in the now-defunct Palestinian rite, which is the source of all Pre-Classical and Classical *piyyut*, the Torah was divided into much

---

[1] On Yom Kippur, the Closing service (נעילה) is added as well, after the Afternoon service.

[2] In Jewish communities outside of Israel, Simhat Torah is the second day of Shemini Atzeret. In Israel, Simhat Torah is celebrated on the one and only day of Shemini Atzeret.

shorter portions (sing. סדר), such that the whole Pentateuch was completed over the course of three and a half years. The Palestinian rite also differs from the Babylonian in that the beginning and end of the lectionary cycle were not fixed *vis-à-vis* the festival cycle. The Palestinian lectionary was completed not on a special, fixed day, but rather simply on the Sabbath on which the last portion was read. This Sabbath was named after the portion: Shabbat *Ve-zot ha-berakha* (Deut 33:1).

As indicated, the Torah reading takes place on Sabbaths and festivals between the Morning and Additional services.[3] The services themselves are founded on the two major Jewish statutory prayers: the *Shema* (שמע) and the *Amida* (עמידה), which are always found in this order. These, in turn, are composed of strings of benedictions (sing. ברכה), which may be thought of as being the minimal meaningful liturgical units. For our purposes, a benediction may be anatomized into three parts: 1) the introductory formula "Blessed are You O Lord, our God, king of the universe…" (ברוך אתה יי אלהינו מלך העולם), 2) a body, in which the specific content of the benediction is given, and 3) a closing formula, beginning with "Blessed are You O Lord…" (ברוך אתה יי), which briefly re-capitulates the specific content of the benediction. When these benedictions are strung together, as in the *Shema* and the *Amida*, the opening formula is omitted in all but the first benediction of the string.

The *Shema* is recited twice daily: in the Evening and Morning services. At its core lies the declamation out-loud of the verse "Hear O Israel, the Lord is Our God, the Lord is One" (Deut 6:4), followed by the reading of a number of associated biblical pericopes: Deut 6:5–9; 11:13–21; Num 15:37–41. Benedictions precede and follow this scriptural material. In the Evening service two benedictions precede and two follow. In the Morning service two benedictions precede and one follows. The first benediction of the *Shema* of the Morning service serves as a locus for the recitation of the *trishagion* (קדושה), which is constituted by the brief doxologies found in Isa 6:3 (…קדוש קדוש קדוש) and Ezek 3:12 (ברוך כבוד יי ממקומו).

In the Evening and Morning services, the recitation of the *Shema* is followed by the *Amida*, which is the rabbinic prayer *par excellence*. For our present purpose, the Afternoon service of profane days, as well as the Additional service of sacred days (i.e., those prayer-occasions on which the *Shema* is not recited) begin directly with the *Amida*. The Hebrew word

[3] An exception to this general rule occurs on Yom Kippur, whose liturgy includes an additional reading that takes place in the course of the Afternoon service.

amida, which means "standing," refers to the fact that the prayer is recited silently by every individual of the community while standing. Following the silent recitation, the entire *Amida* is repeated out-loud by the precentor of the community (שליח ציבור), who is sometimes also called a *hazzan*.[4] The *Amida* of profane days is composed of 18 benedictions.[5] This string of 18 benedictions is internally articulated into three groups: 1) the first three, which are doxological, 2) the middle twelve, in which specific requests are addressed to God, and 3) the last three, in which God is thanked. The *Amida* of the Additional service, on the other hand, which is recited on Sabbaths, festivals (including the intermediate days) and New Moons, as well as the other three *Amidot* of the Sabbaths and festivals (not including the intermediate days) are composed of seven benedictions. This number is arrived at by retaining the first three and the last three benedictions of the profane *Amida* while replacing the middle twelve by one single benediction, called "the benediction of the sanctity of the day" (ברכת קדושת היום) whose theme is constituted by the occasion on which the *Amida* is recited.[6]

The third benediction of the *Amida*, when repeated out-loud by the precentor (see note 4), serves as a locus for the recitation of the *trishagion*, which in the modern-day rites consists of at least three verses: Isa 6:3,

---

[4] In all modern rites, the *Amida* of the Evening service is not repeated by the precentor. However, in the ancient Palestinian rite, which is the focus of our present interest, this *Amida* was repeated as well as the others.

[5] Hence the alternative name *shemone esre* for the weekday *Amida*. In all modern rites, the weekday *Amida* actually contains 19 benedictions. The additional benediction results from the splitting of benediction 14 into two separate benedictions. This splitting took place in the Babylonian rite, with which all modern rites are aligned to one degree or another. The Palestian rite, on the other hand, employs a weekday *Amida* of 18 benedictions.

[6] An exception to this rule is constituted by the *Amida* recited during the Additional service of Rosh Hashana, which is composed of nine benedictions. The additional number results from the fact that this *Amida* serves as a liturgical matrix for the tri-partite blowing of the shofar, which is accompanied by the recitation of three groups of biblical verses: the *malkhiyot* (Kingship verses), *zikhronot* (Remembrance verses), and *shofarot* (Shofar verses). The *malkhiyot* are hosted by the "benediction of the sanctity of the day," while the *zikhronot* and *shofarot* are provided with their own benedictions, which immediately follow. In effect, therefore, instead of a single "benediction of the sanctity of the day" being inserted between the opening group of three and the closing group of three, three special benedictions associated with the sacred occasion are inserted between these two groups, thereby making up a total of nine benedictions.

Ezek 3:12, and Ps 146:10 (ימלוך יי לעולם...).[7] As mentioned above, a *trishagion* consisting of the first two verses is likewise recited in the first benediction of the morning *Shema*. In the Palestinian rite, the *trishagion* as recited in the *Amida* always consists of five verses, for after Ezek 3:12 it contains the first and last verses of the *Shema*: Deut 6:4 (שמע ישראל...), Num 15:41 (אני יי אלהיכם). The Palestinian version of the *trishagion* as recited in the morning *Shema* does not differ from that employed in the contemporary rites. A major point of disagreement between the Babylonian rite, together with all of the modern rites that are aligned with it, and the Palestinian rite, is the frequency of the recitation of the *trishagion*. In the Babylonian rite, it is recited on every possible occasion. In the Palestinian rite, on the other hand, the *trishagion* of the first benediction of the Morning *Shema* is recited only on festivals and Sabbaths, while the *trishagion* of the *Amida* is recited only in the *Amida* of the Morning service of festivals, Sabbaths, New Moons, the intermediate days of festivals, and Hanukkah.[8]

3. Typological Dating

Having reviewed the basic liturgical framework that serves as a host for *piyyut*, we now turn to a description of the Pre-Classical phase of this literature. Before proceeding, however, a methodological point that underlies the entire description should be stressed: the internal chronology of the development of the *piyyut* is almost entirely based on typology, while external evidence for the dating of *piyyutim* is, for all intents and purposes, non-existent. The fundamental assumption made by the typological model of the evolution of Pre-Classical and Classical *piyyut* is that its forms develop from simple and internally undifferentiated to complex and internally articulated. This assumption has allowed scholarship to interpret typological series as reflecting chronological development. However, the chronological interpretation cannot be independently confirmed through appeal to external data. If, therefore, the typological model is shown to be

---

[7] The last verse, Ps 146:10, actually functions as a bridge between the liturgical *trishagion* and the closing formula of the third benediction. However, in liturgical practice it has been assimilated into the *trishagion* proper.

[8] The exceptions are Rosh Hashana, on which the *trishagion* is recited in the *Amida* of the Additional service, and Yom Kippur, on which it is recited in the *Amida* of the Additional, Afternoon, and Closing services.

based on false premises, then the chronology that it implies will require revision.

4. Pre-Classical *Piyyut*: Liturgical, Formal and Literary Characteristics

The earliest stratum of the *piyyut* literature, referred to as Pre-Classical, is represented by self-contained poems that are composed for recitation on one or another liturgical occasion, ranging from the marginal to the very important. Such poems do not affect the structure of the liturgy directly, rather being "tacked on" in the appropriate place. Thus, for example, the *seliḥa* (סליחה) is a penitential poem recited as part of a penitential liturgy, particularly on Yom Kippur. The *Hoshana* (הושענא) is a hymn recited in the course of the circumambulatory procession held in the synagogue on (the seventh day of) Sukkot. The *teqiata* (תקיעתא) are poems that accompany the blowing of the shofar on Rosh Hashana (see note 6). The *seder avoda* is an extensive poetic description of the sacrificial service of the High Priest in the Temple on Yom Kippur, provided with a long preamble that reviews the history of the world leading up to the election of Aaron. It is recited on Yom Kippur. These poems range widely in structure and artistry from the simple and primitive to the complex and exquisite. However, they all share a number of features. The first of these features has already been mentioned: all of these poems are self-contained, i.e., they do not articulate together with other poems to form poetic *compositions* in accordance with pre-determined, genre-specific patterns. Furthermore, the poems are anonymous, there being no embedded acrostic signatures within them. On the other hand, the poems are usually arranged in accordance with the alphabetic acrostic principle. The poems furthermore lack rhyme. The most obvious poetic type answering to the properties that have been enumerated thus far is the litany. As an example, let us take a simple *hoshana*:[9]

אֹם אֲנִי חֲמָּה / בָּרָה כַּחַמָּה / גֹּלָה וְסוּרָה / דָּמְתָה לְתָמָר...

This poem consists of an alphabetical list of epithets for the nation of Israel. It lacks any meaningful line structure, and is not rhymed. A grammatical rhyme may easily be generated on the basis of such a litany, by means

---

[9] Goldschmidt מחזור סוכות = 1981, 175–176.

of having each one of the iterations end on a fixed grammatical element. Thus we find in another *hoshana*:[10]

לְמַעַן אֲמִתָּךְ / לְמַעַן בְּרִיתָךְ / לְמַעַן גָּדְלָךְ / לְמַעַן דָּתָךְ...

Such litanies are the most primitive possible type of *piyyut*,[11] and represent one end of the spectrum in terms of the complexity and artistry encountered in the poetry of the Pre-Classical phase. If we continue along the spectrum, we encounter true metrical organization of the poetic line. In the Pre-Classical period, meter is based on stress. Every Hebrew word or word-group bears a strongly marked expiratory stress. In *piyyut*, the poetic foot is a unit that contains two such stresses. The line, in turn may be composed of either three or four feet, the latter being by far the more popular type. As an example, let us take the opening lines of the earliest known *teqiata*:[12]

עָלֵינוּ לְשַׁבֵּחַ / לַאֲדוֹן הַכֹּל // לָתֵת גְּדוּלָּה / לְיוֹצֵר בְּרֵאשִׁית
שֶׁלֹּא עָשָׂנוּ / כְּגוֹיֵי הָאֲרָצוֹת // וְלֹא שָׂמָנוּ / כְּמִשְׁפְּחוֹת הָאֲדָמָה

Our duty's to praise / the Cosmocrator // to ascribe might / to the Maker of Creation
Who made us not / like the earth's peoples // nor likened us / to the families of the world.

Here, in addition to the quadripartite division of the poetic line into feet of two stresses each, we note also the division of the line into two parallelistic hemistichs. The latter feature is inherited from the biblical *parallelismus membrorum*, and is vestigial in *piyyut*, to the extent that it has been replaced by the stress meter as the main poetic organizational principle. Let us now see an example of a tripartite line. Such lines are most commonly encountered in Pre-Classical *seliḥot*. The following are the opening lines of a *seliḥa* for Yom Kippur.[13] This *seliḥa* is strophic, by virtue of being organized into groups of three lines each that are separated by a refrain (note the grammatical rhyme in the second line and in the refrain):

---

[10] GOLDSCHMIDT מחזור סוכות = 1981, 170–171.

[11] In fact, litanies are attested already in the biblical literature: see, for example, Ps 136, 150. The only major structural difference between biblical and *piyyut* litanies is that in *piyyut* the extent of the litany is strictly delimited by means of the acrostic. Structural consistency is, in general, an outstanding feature of *piyyut*.

[12] GOLDSCHMIDTראש השנה = 1981, 229. This and the following translations are mine.

[13] YAHALOM 2005, 132–137.

אָיוֹם וְנוֹרָא / צוֹם הֶעָשׂוֹר / לְכָל הַיְצוּרִים
אֵין תְּלוּת פָּנִים / בּוֹשֶׁת לְכָל פָּנִים / לְאָבוֹת וּבָנִים
אֱמוּנָה תוֹכִיחַ / צֶדֶק תַּעֲנֶה / חוֹתָמְךָ אֱמֶת

הַנְּשָׁמָה לָךְ / וְהַגּוּף פָּעֳלָךְ / חוּסָה עַל עֲמָלָךְ

בְּעָרְכְּךָ מִשְׁפָּט / תִּקְרָא לַשָּׁמַיִם / לִיתֵּן הַנֶּפֶשׁ...

Frightening and awesome / is the fast of the Tenth / for all creatures.
No favors dispensed / but all faces ashamed / both fathers and sons.
Keeping faith You reprove / righteousness You speak / You seal is truth.

The soul is yours / and the body too / have mercy on Your own!

When You lay down justice / You'll call to the heavens / to yield up the soul…

These quotes are sufficient to exemplify the main formal characteristics of Pre-Classical *piyyut*. We will now similarly attempt to sketch its literary and aesthetic characteristics. Much of Pre-Classical *piyyut* is narrative, and in this regard it is rooted in biblical history. This property may be demonstrated on the basis of the *seder avoda*, which is the most important and highly cultivated genre of Pre-classical *piyyut*. As indicated above, the *seder avoda* opens with a long preamble, which describes the history of the world. The following are the first four lines of a Pre-Classical *seder avoda*:[14]

אַתָּה כּוֹנַנְתָּ / עוֹלָם מֵרֹאשׁ / יָסַדְתָּ תֵּבֵל / וּבְרִיּוֹת יָצַרְתָּ
בְּשׁוּרְךָ עוֹלָם / תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ / גֵּרַשְׁתָּ אֹפֶל / וְהִצַּבְתָּ נֹגַהּ
גֹּלֶם תַּבְנִיתְךָ / מִן הָאֲדָמָה יָצַרְתָּ / וְעַל עֵץ הַדַּעַת / אוֹתוֹ הִפְקַדְתָּ
דְּבָרְךָ זָנַח / וְנִזְנַח מֵעֵדֶן / וְלֹא כִלִּיתוֹ / לְמַעַן יְגִיעַ כַּפֶּיךָ

You established / the world of old / founded the earth / and shaped [its] creatures.
Seeing the world / formless and void / You drove out darkness / and set up light.
A lump in Your image / You shaped of the earth /and of the Tree of Knowledge / gave him a command.
He forsook Your word / and was driven from Eden / but You destroyed him not / for [he's] the work of Your hands.

As may be seen on the basis of this short example, the narrative follows the biblical story quite closely. In its narratives, Pre-Classical *piyyut* does make reference to the rabbinic exegetical (aggadic) tradition, but such references are relatively infrequent and easily identified. As an example, let us take the 13th line of the same *seder avoda*, which speaks of Jacob:

---

[14] SWARTZ/YAHALOM 2005, 69–93. This work contains a number of important *sidrei avoda*, together with English translations.

מִגִּזְעוֹ / אִישׁ תָּם הוֹצֵאתָ / חֲתַּם בִּבְרִיתְךָ / מֵרֶחֶם לֻקַּח

From his stock / You brought forth a blameless man; / sealed with Your pact / from the womb he was taken.

According to this line, Jacob was born circumcised ("sealed with the pact"), following a tradition found in rabbinic *aggada*.[15] The appearance of such traditions in Pre-Classical *piyyut* is not uncommon. However, they usually appear within an easily intelligible narrative context into which they are embedded in a straightforward manner.

Two other important literary characteristics, which Pre-Classical *piyyut* appears to share with other poetic traditions of Late Antiquity, are the tendency to describe a scene by means of concentrating on its details, as well as by means of imagined dialogue.[16] Let us illustrate the first characteristic from the same *seder avoda*, in ll. 17–18 in which the vestments of the High Priest are enumerated:

פֵּאַרְתּוֹ / בְּבִגְדֵי שְׂרָד / וּבְקָרְבְּנוֹתָיו / הֵפַר כַּעַסְךָ
צִיץ וּמְעִיל / כְּתֹנֶת וּמִכְנְסֵי בַד / חשֶׁן וְאֵפֹד / מִצְנֶפֶת וְאַבְנֵט

You exalted him / with woven clothes / and with his victims / he appeased Your anger;
Diadem and robe / cloak and pants of linen / breastplate and Ephod / turban and sash.

The use of dialogue may be observed in the *seliḥa* איום ונורא that has been quoted above, in which is found a dispute between the body and the soul. The following is the third strophe, in which the body speaks:

גֹּלֶם יַעַן / בִּהְיוֹת בִּי הַנֶּפֶשׁ / הִיא הִרְשִׁיעַתְנִי
גַּם הָיְתָה לִי / כְּמִכְשׁוֹל עֲלֵי אוֹרַח / לִפְנֵי עִוֵּר
גַּם בְּעוֹפְפָהּ מֶינִּי / הָשְׁלַכְתִּי לְרִימָּה / כְּמוֹ אֶבֶן דּוּמָם

The lump answers, / "When I had a soul / she led me to sin,
Indeed being to me / as a block in the way / of a man who's blind.
Then when she flew / I was cast to the worms / like a motionless stone."

Beyond the use of enumerative description and imagined dialogue, the metaphoric/figurative language of Pre-Classical *piyyut* is almost exclusively limited to tropes and figures attested in the biblical corpus.[17] The one major exception to this general rule is the use of epithets (antonomasia), which is one of the most outstanding features of *piyyut*

---

[15] See GINZBERG 1947, 1.315; and the sources cited by id. 1947, 5.273, n. 26.

[16] For this aspect of the comparative study of Late Antique hymnography, see MÜNZ-MANOR 2010.

[17] The question of the figurative language in Pre-Classical *piyyut* is investigated in MÜNZ-MANOR 2011.

literature throughout the ages. Thus, persons and things are not referred to directly, but rather by means of metonyms. In some cases, the use of the metonym is so pervasive that it becomes a fixed signifier, a stable element of the *piyyut* lexicon. We have already encountered a number of such epithets in the text samples quoted above: אֹם אֲנִי חַמָּה "A nation [who says] 'I am the sun'" (Song 8:10) [=Israel],[18] צוֹם הֶעָשׂוֹר "The fast of the tenth [day]" (cf. Lev 16:29) [=Yom Kippur], גֹּלֶם "lump [of clay]" (cf. Ps 139:16) [=man, the body], אִישׁ תָּם "a blameless man" (Gen 25:27) [=Jacob].

Yet another aspect of *piyyut* literature throughout the ages that is attested already in Pre-Classical phase is the peculiar *piyyut* idiom.[19] The most obvious, general feature of this idiom is that it is quite difficult to comprehend for the non-specialist reader. A large part of this difficulty is due to factors that have already been mentioned: the extensive use of epithets, as well as the use of aggadic midrash, which is more or less straightforward in Pre-Classical *piyyut*, but develops into a dense network of interlocking, frequently subtle, allusions in the Classical phase. An additional source of this difficulty is rooted in specifically linguistic features. When compared to other, "natural" dialects/phases of Hebrew, *viz.* the Biblical and Rabbinic, *piyyut* Hebrew, which is a strictly "literary" idiom, shows a marked tendency towards shortened forms, both in the noun and verb. Thus, in the nominal sphere, we note a preference for words of the pattern קֶטֶל. This preference manifests itself in the formation of new words that are peculiar to *piyyut*: שֶׁפֶט ← משפט "judgment," מַעַשׂ ← מעשה "deed," תֶּשֶׁר ← תשורה "gift," תַּחַן ← תחינה "entreaty." The outstanding characteristic of the morphological mechanism whose operation we see here is that it collapses a variety of nominal patterns, which employ several different root types, into one single one, which is also (historically, at any rate) the shortest possible Hebrew trilateral nominal pattern. The same tendency towards shortening may be seen in the verb. *Piyyut* literature makes extensive use of the apocopated III/weak imperfect form attested in Biblical Hebrew: יַעַשׂ ← יעשה "He will do," יַעַן ← יענה "He will answer," etc. The resulting verbal pattern is the exact counterpart of the nominal קֶטֶל pattern. A similar pattern results in the case of the apocopated *Hifil* III/weak infinitival forms of the type לְהַעַל ← להעלות "to raise." Thus also with *Hifil*

[18] As already pointed out above, the entire *hoshana* from which this example is drawn is composed of an alphabetical string of epithets for Israel.

[19] For the study of *piyyut* language, see GOLDENBERG 1971; RAND 2006; RAND (forthcoming); YAHALOM 1985.

III/weak perfects: הַעַל ← העלה "He raised." In the perfect, there is a tendency for all weak verbs to be conjugated in the pattern that in standard Hebrew morphology is reserved for II/weak *Qal* verbs: סָד ← יסד "He founded," סָע ← נסע "He set out," עָשׂ ← עשה "He did," גָּשׁ ← נִגשׁ "He approached," כָּל ← כלה "He completed," בָּט ← הביט "He looked." These few examples make the general preference of *piyyut* language for shorter forms quite clear.

5. The Relationship between Classical *Piyyut* and the Liturgy

In general, it may be said that the literary and linguistic characteristics that we have noted persist into the Classical phase of *piyyut* literature, and in some cases show considerable (some would even say "hypertrophic") development therein. In this regard, therefore, we are faced with a picture of evolution and development. However, with regard to formal poetic structure and relation to the liturgy, the transition from the Pre-Classical to the Classical period constitutes a radical break. We will first examine the question of the relationship between *piyyut* and the statutory liturgy. We have seen already that there exists no fixed, consistent relationship between the *piyyutim* of the Pre-Classical period and their liturgical matrix. This is not so in the case of Classical *piyyut*. In the latter, a principle develops for the creation of stable links between *piyyutim* and the two fundamental prayers: the *Shema* and the *Amida*. As noted, these two prayers consist of strings of benedictions. The fundamental principle responsible for the incorporation of Classical *piyyutim* into the liturgy is the principle of symmetry: 1 benediction/1 *piyyut*. In other words, every benediction making up the *Shema* and the *Amida* is accompanied by one *piyyut*. The liturgical mechanism that makes this accompaniment possible is one whereby the *piyyut* becomes a poetic replacement for the (usually prose) body of the benediction. The closing formula of the benediction is always retained, on the other hand. As a result, the statutory formulation of the benediction: "(introductory formula +) body + closing formula" is replaced by a *payyetanic* formulation: "(introductory formula +) *piyyut* + closing formula." Since, moreover, the prayers themselves consist of strings of benedictions, the *piyyutim* that accompany the benedictions making up any given prayer are also strung together into the various types of *piyyut* compositions. These compositions constitute the fundamental genres of Classical *piyyut*.

In general, the occasion for the recitation of the *piyyutim* is public prayer. The *piyyutim* were recited by the precentor, while the congregation's role was limited to the repetition of short refrains and the

like. From the historical point of view, it is all but certain that the Classical *payyetanim*, i.e., the composers of *piyyutim*, served as synagogue precentors. The following description focuses on the *Amida* and the *piyyut* compositions by which it is accompanied. However, the principles of liturgical organization that it analyzes are equally applicable to the *Shema* and its accompanying *piyyut* compositions.

The generic term for the genre of *piyyut* composition that accompanies the *Amida* is *qerova*. The *qerova* is by far the most common genre of Classical *piyyut*. The most basic type of *qerova* is the kind that accompanies a festival or Sabbath *Amida* in which, according to the Palestinian rite, the *trishagion* is not recited. As noted above, such an *Amida* consists of seven benedictions. By definition, therefore, the *qerova* that accompanies such an *Amida* consists of seven *piyyutim*, one for each benediction. Hence this type of *qerova* is called *shivata*. The simplest case is the Sabbath *shivata*, which is composed of seven structurally parallel *piyyutim*. These *piyyutim* constitute a compositional unity: e.g., they may all share one alphabetical acrostic, or each one of them, in sequence, may include a word from a particular biblical verse, such that when the *piyyutim* are taken all together the text of the entire verse is reconstituted. In the festival *shivata*, on the other hand, the middle benediction (i.e., "the benediction of the sanctity of the day") is accompanied by an independent, self-contained *piyyut*, while the compositional unity is constituted by the first three *piyyutim* together with the last three. The principle of "1 benediction/1 *piyyut*" is also maintained in the case of the *Amida* of profane days, which is composed of 18 benedictions. The *qerova* composition for such *Amidot* contains 18 *piyyutim*.

The principle of symmetry is abrogated in the case of the *Amida* of seven benedictions that, according to the Palestinian liturgical rite, includes the recitation of the *trishagion*, i.e., the *Amida* of the Morning service of festivals and Sabbaths. In such cases, the *trishagion* becomes the *telos* of the *piyyut* composition that accompanies the *Amida*, which means that the *piyyut* composition is brought to an end in its third benediction, this being the benediction in which the *trishagion* is recited. The Hebrew term for *trishagion* is *qedusha*, and the *piyyut* composition that accompanies the *Amida* in which a *qedusha* is recited is called a *qedushta*. A *qedushta* opens with three symmetrical *piyyutim*, which accompany the first three benedictions of the *Amida*. In a composition built on the symmetrical principle, the third *piyyut* would have been followed by the closing formula of the third benediction, after which would have come the *piyyut* accompanying the fourth benediction. In the *qedushta*, on the other hand, the third *piyyut* is followed by an internally articulated string of independent *piyyutim* that terminate in the recitation of the *trishagion*. The

structural features of the *piyyutim* of which this string is composed, together with the manner of their internal articulation, are specified by the rules governing the *qedushta* genre. After the *trishagion*, the remaining portion of the *Amida* is recited in its statutory form, i.e., without the accompaniment of *piyyutim*.

In the case of the *qedushta*, the symmetry principle of "1 benediction/1 *piyyut*" is abrogated as a result of the fact that a certain element contained within the *Amida*, i.e., the *trishagion*/*qedusha*, becomes the focal point of the *piyyut* composition. The abrogation is manifested in two ways. First, the benediction in which the *trishagion* is recited, i.e., the one that constitutes the liturgical focus of the *qedushta*, is accompanied by more than one *piyyut*. Second, the *qedushta* does not include *piyyutim* that accompany the recitation of each one of the benedictions that constitute the *Amida* in which the *qedushta* is recited. Rather, only the first three benedictions of the *Amida* are accompanied by the recitation of *piyyutim*.

The *trishagion* is not the only liturgical element that occasions the abrogation of the principle of symmetry governing *piyyut* composition. As noted above, the recitation of the *trishagion* in the Palestinian liturgy takes place on limited occasions. Thus also, other liturgical occasions necessitate the insertion of special elements into the *Amida*. To the extent that the *Amida* into which the special element is inserted is accompanied by a *piyyut* composition, such an insertion usually involves the abrogation of the principle of symmetry. The abrogation, however, is never as radical as the one observed in the case of the *qedushta*. Two examples will suffice to illustrate the point.

We have seen above that the Jewish liturgical year is divided into seasons of Rain and Dew. The switch between the two seasons is marked in the *Amida* by means of the insertion of a brief text into the second benediction. The *Amida* of the Additional service of Shemini Atzeret marks the switch from Dew to Rain, and the *Amida* of the Additional service of the first day of Passover marks the switch from Rain to Dew. Ordinarily, the *Amida* of the Additional service of a festival would be accompanied by a *shivata* in which the principle of symmetry is observed. However, the special text inserted into the second benediction of the *Amida* serves as a focal point for the composition of additional, quite lengthy, and structurally independent *piyyutim* that serve as a kind of poetic introduction to this special text. As a result of the inclusion of these additional *piyyutim*, the principle of symmetry is abrogated in that the second benediction, as opposed to all the others, is accompanied by more than one *piyyut*. In this case, therefore, an otherwise symmetrical *piyyut* composition absorbs additional elements at a certain liturgically marked point.

Another type of abrogation is represented by the *qerova* accompanying the *Amida* of (the Morning service) of the Ninth of Av. The *Amida* of the Ninth of Av is of the profane type, i.e., it contains 18 benedictions. The 14th benediction of the profane *Amida* is specifically devoted to the theme of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and therefore serves as an appropriate locus for the insertion of a special pericope on the Ninth of Av, which is the liturgical occasion marking the destruction of the Temple. The *piyyut* liturgy marks this occasion by inserting special liturgical dirges called *qinot* (sing. קינה) into the 14th benediction. Such *qinot* are independent poems and are attested already in the Pre-Classical period. In the Classical period, in addition to *qinot*, special *qerovot* for the Ninth of Av are also attested. Ordinarily, a *qerova* accompanying an *Amida* of 18 benedictions is built up of a series of 18 *piyyutim*. In the *qerovot* for the Ninth of Av, on the other hand, the series is interrupted after the 14th *piyyut*, at which point *qinot* are inserted. The series is, moreover, not resumed after the *qinot*. In this case, therefore, a symmetrical *piyyut* composition is truncated at the point of insertion of the liturgically marked text(s).

It has been observed above that formally, to the extent that the symmetry principle of “1 benediction/1 *piyyut*” is observed, a *piyyut* is a replacement for the statutory (prose) formulation of the body of a benediction. And since the body of any benediction is devoted to the exposition of the theme of that benediction, be it praise or thanksgiving or entreaty, the *piyyut* that replaces it would, *a priori*, be concerned with the same theme. However, in the Classical *piyyut*, the relationship between the theme of a benediction and the *piyyut* accompanying it is limited, frequently being vestigial and/or purely formal (i.e., realized by means of the use of key words and the like). Put another way, the themes of Classical *piyyut* range far and wide beyond the themes of the statutory liturgy that it accompanies, and are frequently entirely independent of the latter. For the most part, they are rooted in the two parallel cycles that, as noted above, are the basis of the Jewish liturgical calendar: 1) the festival cycle, and 2) the cycle of Scriptural lections. Thus, *piyyut* compositions written for the festivals address historical, allegorical, theological, etc. themes related to the particular festival for which they are composed. Such compositions do not constitute cycles in the strict literary sense, although the *oeuvres* of the major Classical *payyetanim* tend to range over the whole liturgical year. In addition to compositions for the festivals, the Classical corpus contains several massive cycles of *piyyut* compositions written to

accompany the triennial Scriptural lections. Each of the compositions in these cycles addresses the themes of the particular Scriptural lection (together with the accompanying prophetic lection) to which it is devoted. The most famous of these cycles are the *qedushtaot* of Yannai.[20] In both cases, the Classical *piyyut* makes heavy literary use of the rabbinic, predominantly aggadic, corpus.

6. The Major Poetic Innovation of Classical *Piyyut*

We have seen above that the main organizational principle of the Pre-Classical poetic line is stress meter. This metrical principle is well attested also in Classical *piyyut*. In addition to it, Classical *piyyut* also developed a word-counting meter, whereby the number of words (i.e., independent graphemes) in the poetic line is fixed. The acrostic principle also persists from the Pre-Classical into the Classical phase, with the difference that whereas the former knows only alphabetic acrostics, in the latter name acrostics are employed as well. The practical result of this development is that the names of the Classical poets (though almost nothing beyond that) are known from their compositions.

The most revolutionary development of the Classical period *vis-à-vis* the Pre-Classical is the development of rhyme. In the Pre-Classical phase, strophically organized *piyyutim* are relatively rare, and in any case the means for the generation of a poetic strophe are "weak," being limited to the iteration of acrostic letters (i.e., a strophe being composed of several lines, each of which begins with the same acrostic letter) and/or the use of refrains (i.e., a strophe being a group of lines separated from another group of lines by means of the refrain). As a result, the most stable poetic unit of the Pre-Classical period is the poetic line, composed of either three or four feet. In the Classical period, this line is transformed into a strophe, probably through the agency of internal rhyme: i.e., the internally rhyming feet of the Pre-Classical line become the rhyming lines of the Classical strophe. As an example, let us take the first line/strophe of a *piyyut* from a *qedushta* for Rosh Hashana by Eleazar Qillir (fl. early 7th century). From

[20] Yannai's *qedushtaot* for Genesis have been published with an English translation by LIEBER 2010. This work contains an extensive and valuable introduction, including a description and analysis of the structure of the Yannaic *qedushta*, cf. 35–64.

the point of view of Pre-Classical *piyyut*, the verbal material that it contains may easily be organized into a three-part line:[21]

אַדֶּרֶת מַמְלָכָה / עַל מָה הֱשְׁלְכָה / וְעוֹד לֹא מָלְכָה

However, comparison to analogous *piyyutim* in the Qillirian corpus conclusively demonstrates that the material is to be arranged into a three-line strophe:

אַדֶּרֶת מַמְלָכָה
עַל מָה הֱשְׁלְכָה
וְעוֹד לֹא מָלְכָה

It is reasonable to suppose, furthermore, that the development of the strophe as a stable, fundamental poetic unit went hand in hand with the emergence of the compositional genres that characterize Classical *piyyut*. As we have seen, the individual *piyyutim* making up a symmetrical *piyyut* composition in which the principle of "1 benediction/1 *piyyut*" is observed constitute a compositional unity; a poetic system in which the strophe is a fundamental, clearly delimited unit, makes it possible to realize such a compositional unity as a series of strophes. In other words, the symmetrical *piyyut* composition is actually a strophic poem, in which each strophe (or pair of strophes) is dedicated to one of the benedictions making up the prayer that serves as a host for the composition.

7. The Performance of Classical *Piyyut*

The data at our disposal make it possible to produce a highly detailed description of the formal/structural properties of *piyyut* as well as of its functional/textual relationship to Jewish liturgy. On the other hand, next to nothing is known of the social context in which *piyyut* liturgy was performed, as well as of the material aspects of its performance. *Piyyut* is barely mentioned in the corpus of Palestinian rabbinic literature, both Tannaitic and Amoraic. This absence of documentation is usually assumed to reflect the fact that this corpus was closed before the flourishing of *piyyut*. The archaeological evidence provided by Palestinian synagogues from the Byzantine period is somewhat more illuminating. Thus, we find themes that are attested in the *piyyut* literature reflected in the material remains of synagogues. This is the case, for instance, with mosaic depic-

[21] GOLDSCHMIDT ראש השנה = 1981, 73–74.

tions of the Binding of Isaac and the Circle of the Zodiac.[22] Though such thematic correspondences account for only a tiny fraction of the rich panoply of themes and motifs that are attested in *piyyut*, they do indicate, unsurprisingly, that the *piyyut* literature was a part of the synagogue world of Late Antique Palestine.

With regard to performance, it has already been mentioned above that the Classical *payyetan* was most likely also the community precentor, which means that in some cases at least, the poet performed his own works. However, it must be stressed in this context that the documents at our disposal provide no (direct) evidence whatsoever with regard to the actual musical performance, if such there was, of the Pre-Classical and Classical *piyyutim* within the synagogue liturgy.[23] Furthermore, the liturgical nature of *piyyut* basically precludes the introduction of the *payyetan* as a literary persona into the poems. The sole apparent exception to this general characterization is to be found in the case of *piyyutim* belonging to a type called *reshut*, which is designed to precede a number of different kinds of *piyyut* composition. The word *reshut* means "permission," and in *piyyutim* belonging to this genre the *payyetan* officially requests the permission of the community to pray on their behalf. By definition, therefore, the *payyetan* is present in such poems as a literary persona. However, this persona is entirely stylized, the *payyetan* representing himself as a wise, humble, and pious sage.[24] This point may be illustrated from the 2nd stanza of a *reshut* by the Classical *payyetan* Pinhas:[25]

---

[22] Note also the use of synagogue inscriptions listing the 24 priestly courses, a well-attested theme in Classical *piyyut* (cf. YAHALOM 1999, 107–08).

[23] FLEISCHER ²2007, 133–36 argues for the use of choirs in the Classical period. His argument, however, is based exclusively on the presence of refrain elements in several different genres of Classical *piyyut* and cannot be corroborated by direct evidence.

[24] The topos of the humble precentor is drawn from the Mishna: מורידין לפני התיבה זקן ורגיל ויש לו בנים וביתו ריקם כדי שיהא לבו שלם בתפלה "They set up (lit. "bring down") an experienced elder before the [Torah] ark, one who has sons and whose home is empty, that his heart might be whole in [his] prayer" (mTaan 2:2).

[25] ELIZUR 2004, 375–377. This particular *reshut* is designed to precede the *piyyutim* accompanying the Kingship, Remembrance, and Shofar verses that are recited on Rosh Hashana (see note 6). The stanza quoted here is built on the acrostic letters *gimel* and *dalet*, and its last line is constituted by a Scriptural quote (in accordance with the pattern observed in all of the stanzas of the *piyyut*).

גַּשְׁתִּי כְּדַךְ וּכְעָנִי
גַּם לֹא הִגְבַּהְתִּי גְּאוֹנִי
דָּגוּל חָנֵּינִי וַעֲנֵינִי
דְּרָכֶיךָ יְיָ הוֹדִיעֵנִי

I approach lowly and humble
Nor have I roused my pride.
Preeminent [God], Have mercy and answer me!
"Teach me Your ways, O Lord!" (Ps. 25:4)

It is easy to see, therefore, that the *reshut* provides no real information with regard to the place of the poet within the synagogue world, and certainly betrays nothing of his literary "self."[26]

The absence of information with regard to the social function and status of the *payyetan* is paralleled by the absence of a meta-literature on the poetics and liturgical function of *piyyut* from the Pre-Classical and Classical periods. The information on this subject that is currently available is entirely the product of modern, inductive research. All that may be said with regard to the period during which *piyyut* actually flourished is that the interplay of imitation and innovation within the context of the rich panoply of *piyyut* genres is clear, albeit indirect, evidence of the fact that a binding genre structure was recognized by those who composed *piyyutim*.[27] In particular, the complexity of the genre inventory of Classical *piyyut*, viewed against the backdrop of its stability through time, is eloquent proof of the fact that the *payyetanim* were aware

[26] Two Classical *reshuyot* include lists of various social groupings existing within and around the synagogue world. The first is a *reshut* by Pinhas for Yom Kippur (ELIZUR 2004, 406–08), which enumerates the following: נבונים "the wise," ישרים "the upright," כהנים "priests," לוים "Levites," חזנים "*hazzanim*," סופרים "scribes," משנני סדרים "those who study the orders [of the Mishna]," מזמרים "singers," and כל העם "the entire congregation." The second list may be found in a *reshut* by Qillir; see RAND 2007, 84*–85*. The information provided by such lists is quite scanty, especially as it is obvious that categories such as "the wise," etc. are generic. On the other hand, category terms that seem to reflect the contemporary reality of the *payyetan*, such as "*hazzanim*" and "singers," can hardly be precisely defined for the period in question (but cf. YAHALOM 1999, 40–43).

[27] A curious, though unique, case of the recognition of the existence of genre structures by the *payyetanim* is the "bibliographical" *seder avoda* אכרעה ואברכה, which systematically lists the *incipits* of ten other *sidrei avoda*. These ten are referred to in l. 2 of אכרעה ואברכה as עשרה הסדרים: see MIRSKY [2]1991, 242–246.

of the existence of the different genres and the rules governing composition within them.[28]

Bibliography

ELIZUR, Sh.: פיוטי רבי פינחס הכהן, Jerusalem 2004.
FLEISCHER, E.: שירת-הקודש העברית בימי-הביניים, Jerusalem ²2007.
GINZBERG, L.: The Legends of the Jews, Philadelphia 1947.
GOLDENBERG, E.: Hebrew Language, Medieval. In: EJ 16 (1971), 1607–1612.
GOLDSCHMIDT, D.: מחזור סוכות שמיני עצרת ושמחת תורה, New York 1981.
– מחזור לימים הנוראים – ראש השנה, New York 1981.
LIEBER, L.: Yannai on Genesis – An Invitation to Piyyut, Cincinnati 2010.
MIRSKY, A.: פיוטי יוסי בן יוסי, Jerusalem ²1991.
MÜNZ-MANOR, O.: Figurative Language in Early Piyyut. In: Giving a Diamond. Essays in Honor of Joseph Yahalom on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, ed. W. VAN BEKKUM and N. KATSUMATA (Études sur le judaisme médiéval 49), Leiden 2011, 51–67.
– Liturgical Poetry in the Late Antique Near East: A Comparative Approach. In: Journal of Ancient Judaism 1 (2010), 336–361.
RAND, M.: Paytanic Hebrew. In Encyclopedia of Hebrew and Hebrew Linguistics (forthcoming).
– Liturgical Compositions for Shemini ‘Atzeret by Eleazar be-rabbi Qillir. In: Ginzei Qedem 3 (2007), 9*–99*.
– Introduction to the Grammar of Hebrew Poetry in Byzantine Palestine, New Jersey, 2006.
SWARTZ, M.D./YAHALOM, J.: Avodah. An Anthology of Ancient Poetry for Yom Kippur, Pennsylvania 2005.
YAHALOM, J.: שפת השיר של הפיוט הארץ-ישראלי הקדום, Jerusalem 1985.
– [YAHALOM, Y.]: "עולם הצער והאבל בגניזה – מעברים וגלגולים של סוגות ספרותיות". In: Ginzei Qedem 1 (2005), 117–137.
– פיוט ומציאות בשלהי הזמן העתיק, Tel Aviv 1999.

[28] This fact is also made clear by the opposite phenomenon: i.e., the collapse of a number of major classical genre structures as evidenced by the “late” manuscripts of the Cairo Geniza.

Les hymnes grecs païens de l'époque hellénistique et romaine

DIDIER PRALON

La littérature hymnique païenne en Grèce ancienne préoccupe les hellénistes depuis quelques décennies. En 2001, W.D. FURLEY et J. M. BREMER ont publié un recueil de textes savamment choisis et commentés. Ils ont d'abord recueilli les textes par lieu de production ou de destination (Crète, Delphes, Délos, Lesbos et l'Ionie, Thèbes, Epidaure, Athènes) depuis l'époque archaïque jusqu'à l'époque romaine. Puis, rompant avec leur démarche initiale, ils ont tiré des drames classiques (Eschyle, Sophocle, Euripide, Aristophane) un choix de textes. Enfin, ils ont regroupé, en *Miscellanea,* cinq hymnes (à Dionysos, à Poséidon, à Artémis, à Apollon pour la dédicace d'un temple à Paros), tirés de recueils tardifs de papyrus.[1] Ils ont sciemment laissé de côté les hymnes hexamétriques épiques, homériques et callimachéens, et les hymnes philosophiques.[2] A la fin du volume I, ils proposent une bibliographie du sujet.[3]

Les hymnes sont encore éparpillés dans divers recueils, si l'on ne tient pas compte des ensembles attribués à un auteur particulier (hymnes homériques,[4] hymnes divers et Péans de Pindare,[5] hymnes de Callimaque,[6]

---

[1] Les hymnes hellénistiques sont déjà dans POWELL 1925, et dans LLOYD-JONES/PARSONS 1983. LLOYD-JONES 2005, n'apporte aucun hymne nouveau.

[2] CANCIK/KÄPPEL viennent de publier les études encore inédites de ZUNTZ 2005.

[3] FREYBURGER/PERNOT 2000 ont proposé une bibliographie analytique. On peut retenir principalement, pour notre sujet, les études suivantes: WÜNSCH 1914; KEYSSNER 1932; MEYER 1933; QUANDT 1962; BREMER 1981; VERSNEL/VAN STRATEN 1981; WEST 1983; PORDOMINGO PARDO 1984; PAVESE 1987; CASSIO/CERRI 1991; LATTKE 1991; ZIMMERMANN 1992; KÄPPEL 1922; FURLEY 1993; BURKERT/STOLZ 1994; CADILI 1995; DEVLIN 1994; BREMER 1995; D'ANGOUR 1997; PULLEYN 1997; STRAUSS CLAY 1997; SCHRÖDER 1999; DORIVAL/PRALON 2000.

[4] ALLEN/SIKES 1904; ALLEN/HALLIDAY/SIKES 1936 (le texte critique est demeuré substantiellement inaltéré par rapport à la première édition, qui repose sur la recension des manuscrits achevée par Allen lui-même. L'édition de 1936 présente un apparat

de Proclus,[7] des orphiques[8]), aucun recueil spécifique ne regroupe les hymnes antiques.

Le mot ὕμνος est un terme vague qui s'applique à toutes sortes de formes poétiques.[9] Chez Homère, le mot ὕμνος, une seule fois employé, désigne, dans un pléonasme, "le chant": Alkinoos souhaite que son hôte "prenne plaisir au festin et au chant du poème" (ὄφρα…) δαιτί τε τέρπηται καὶ ἀοιδῆς ὕμνον ἀκούων… (Hom. Od. VIII 429).

Le terme ne prend explicitement sa signification religieuse qu'à partir de Platon (ce qui ne veut pas dire qu'une telle signification n'ait pas existé auparavant mais aucun témoin ne l'atteste): Socrate explique à Glaucon qu'il faut accorder qu'Homère est le poète le plus accompli "mais savoir qu'il faut accepter dans la cité, dans l'ordre de la poésie, seulement des hymnes pour les dieux et des éloges pour les gens de bien"[11]. Platon y est revenu plus tard: l'Athénien, après avoir posé qu'il faut surveiller les poètes, ajoute: "Après cela, des hymnes des dieux et des éloges associés à des prières pourraient être chantés très correctement, et, après les dieux, de

---

critique fort abrégé, me signale CADILI; dorénavant, la mention CADILI, sans autre référence, renverra à des conversation privées). Cf. CASSOLA 1983 et les diverses éditions commentées d'hymnes particuliers (CASSOLA a contribué à éclaircir les rapports qui relient entre elles les familles manuscrites issues du prototype Ψ, la deuxième branche de la tradition des Hymnes, me signale CADILI).

[5] Cf. MAEHLER 1989; BONA 1988 et RUTHERFORD 2001.

[6] PFEIFFER 1953. Cf. aussi ASPER 2004, 387–457. On attend l'édition promise de LEHNUS dans la Teubneriana.

[7] VOGT 1957; VAN DEN BERG 2001.

[8] QUANDT 1962; RICCIARDELLI 2000; BERNABE 2005, 244–261 pour les fragments d'hymnes supposés anciens.

[9] L'étymologie de ὕμνος reste obscure. On le fait dériver de ὑμὴν, soit au sens ancien de "lien" (établi par la comparaison), soit au sens de "cri rituel" (poussé lors du mariage). Cf. CHANTRAINE 1977, 1156. BADER 1990, 34–35, pose un radical *sh2-u-men signifiant "ce qui sert à lier en enveloppant". BLANC 1999, le relie au latin *sonare* et lui donne le sens de "son" (sounding). Cette étymologie est citée par FORD 2002, 12, n. 27. Cf. aussi la notice de MARKWALD 2010, 728–729. DURBEC me signale l'étude de NAGY 2009, 189–198: dans son essence, l'hymne, associant la danse et le chant, se caractérise par la fluidité de la parole (et des gestes).

[10] BENTLEY avait inutilement proposé de corriger ὕμνον en οἶμον (emprunté à l'Hymne à Hermès, vers 451), tout aussi obscur étymologiquement (cf. CHANTRAINE 1974, 783f. et 784) et signifiant à la fois "le chemin" et "le chant". Les éditeurs d'Homère éludent la difficulté: GARVIE 1994, 322 à VIII 429, se borne à taxer l'expression de "very odd phrase". Cf. SVARLIEN 1991).

[11] (χρὴ…) εἰδέναι δὲ ὅτι ὅσον μόνον ὕμνους θεοῖς καὶ ἐγκώμια τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ποιήσεως παραδεκτέον εἰς πόλιν (République X 607A4–5).

la même manière, à l'endroit des démons et des héros pourraient se faire des prières accompagnées d'éloges convenant à eux tous"[12]. Dans la réplique suivante, l'Athénien propose d'accorder des éloges aux citoyens qui auront bien œuvré et obéi aux lois… mais seulement après leur mort.

Il faut attendre l'époque hellénistique et même romaine, voire tardo-antique (selon la date que l'on assigne au Proclus de la *Chrestomathie*), pour avoir une nomenclature, toujours incomplète, toujours insatisfaisante, ne serait-ce que parce que, dans le cas précis, elle ne vaut que pour la poésie lyrique:

Au sujet de la poésie lyrique il (Proclus) dit qu'elle a un très grand nombre de parties et qu'elle a différentes sections. Certaines parties en sont pour les dieux, d'autres <pour les hommes, d'autres pour les dieux et> les hommes, d'autres pour les circonstances qui se présentent. Et se rapportent aux dieux (dit-il) l'hymne, le prosodion (chant de procession), le Péan, le dithyrambe, le nome, les adonidies, l'iobacchos, les hyporchèmes (chants de danse). Envers les hommes des éloges, l'épinicie (chants de victoire), les scolies (chansons à boire), les poèmes amoureux, les épithalames, les hyménées, les silles (poèmes caustiques), les thrènes, les épicédies (chant funéraires). Pour les hommes et les dieux, les Parthénées, les daphnéphoriques, les tripodéphoriques, les oschophoriques (que l'on chante lors des oschophries en portant des branches de vignes couvertes de raisins), les chants de prière: ceux-là, tout écrits qu'ils soient pour les dieux, comportent des louanges d'hommes. Ceux qui sont pour les circonstances qui se présentent ne sont pas des espèces de la poésie lyrique. Les poètes les entreprennent de leur propre chef: en font partie les pragmatiques (liés à des activités en général), les emporiques (liés à des activités marchandes), les apostoliques (qui accompagnent l'envoi de quelqu'un en mission?), les gnomologiques (poèmes sentencieux), les géorgiques, les épistaltiques (qui formule des mandements?).[13]

Et (Proclus) dit que l'hymne reçoit son nom du fait que quelqu'un persévère (ὑπόμονόν τινα εἶναι) et que, pour ainsi dire, il ramène à la mémoire et au souvenir (οἷον εἰς μνήμην καὶ ὑπόμνησιν ἄγειν) les actions de ceux qui font l'objet de l'hymne; ou (le mot vient) du fait de les célébrer (ὕδειν), ce qui signifie les dire.

On appelait en général hymnes tout ce qui était écrit à l'endroit des êtres supérieurs. C'est pourquoi apparaissent s'opposer à l'hymne le prosodion et les autres chants susdits,

---

[12] μετά γε μὴν ταῦτα ὕμνοι θεῶν καὶ ἐγκώμια κεκοινημένα εὐχαῖς ᾄδοιτ' ἂν ὀρθότατα καὶ μετὰ θεοὺς ὡσαύτως περὶ δαίμονάς τε καὶ ἥρωας μετ' ἐγκωμίων εὐχαὶ γίγνοιντ' ἂν τούτοις πᾶσιν πρέπουσαι… (Lois VIII 80).

[13] La dernière catégorie de poèmes égrène des noms si imprécis que SEVERYNS lui-même renonce à les expliquer en détail. En l'absence d'exemples précis, les interprétations, se fondant sur la sémantique propre des mots, ne peuvent que rester, pour la plupart, hypothétiques.

[14] Cette seconde proposition pose une nouvelle étymologie fondée sur la remémoration et la commémoration (ὑπόμνησις).

comme les espèces au genre. Et l'on peut voir[15] écrire 'hymne de prosodion', 'hymne d'éloge', 'hymne de Péan' et ainsi de suite.

On disait prosodion, pour les occasions où l'on va en procession (προσίωσι) vers les autels et les temples; on les chantait au cours de la procession au son de l'aulos, tandis que l'on chantait l'hymne proprement dit au son de la cithare, debout sans bouger.[16]

L'hymne est d'abord traité comme un genre parmi d'autres, alors qu'un peu plus loin, après avoir proposé des étymologies arbitraires (§36, à partir de ὑπομένω "durer", d'ὑπόμνησις "remémoration" et du glossème ὕδειν "dire"), Proclus revient sur sa nomenclature et adopte une classification aristotélicienne par genre (ὕμνος seul) et par espèces (ὕμνος + génitif).

Bien que le terme serve explicitement de générique à l'ensemble des chants religieux en l'honneur des "êtres supérieurs", les autres dénominations caractérisant des espèces du genre hymne, le sens propre et restreint du mot (ὁ κυρίως ὕμνος) ne s'en maintient pas moins: l'hymne proprement dit se chante debout, sans déplacement, au son de la cithare.

De façon non moins étrange, les παρθένια, les δαφνηφορικά, les τριποδηφορικά (si l'ajout de WESTPHAL se justifie)[17], les ὠσχοφορικά, les

---

[15] SEVERYNS 1939, 120, explique l'étrange formule ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἀκούειν γραφόντων par le fait que depuis longtemps ἀκούειν s'emploie au sens de "lire" (Polybe I 13, 6, etc.).

[16] περὶ μελικῆς ποιήσεως, § 32–40: Περὶ δὲ μελικῆς ποιήσεώς φησιν ὡς πολυμερεστάτη τε καὶ διαφόρους ἔχει τομάς. Ἃ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῆς μεμέρισται θεοῖς, ἃ δὲ <ἀνθρώποις, ἃ δὲ θεοῖς καὶ> ἀνθρώποις, ἃ δὲ εἰς τὰς προσπιπτούσας περιστάσεις. Καὶ εἰς θεοὺς μὲν ἀναφέρεσθαι ὕμνον, προσόδιον, παιᾶνα, διθύραμβον, νόμον, ἀδωνίδια, ἰόβακχον, ὑπορχήματα. Εἰς δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἐγκώμια, ἐπίνικον, σκόλια, ἐρωτικά, ἐπιθαλάμια, ὑμεναίους, σίλλους, θρήνους, ἐπικήδεια. Εἰς θεοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπους παρθένια, δαφνηφορικά, τριποδηφορικά, ὠσχοφορικά, εὐκτικά· ταῦτα γὰρ εἰς θεοὺς γραφόμενα καὶ ἀνθρώπων περιείληφεν ἐπαίνους. Τὰ δὲ εἰς τὰς προσπιπτούσας περιστάσεις οὐκ ἔστι μὲν εἴδη τῆς μελικῆς, ὑπ' αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐπικεχείρηται· τούτων δέ ἐστι πραγματικά, ἐμπορικά, ἀποστολικά, γνωμολογικά, γεωργικά, ἐπισταλτικά.

Καί φησι τὸν ὕμνον μὲν ὠνομάσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπόμονόν τινα εἶναι καὶ οἷον εἰς μνήμην καὶ ὑπόμνησιν ἄγειν τὰς πράξεις τῶν ὑμνουμένων· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδειν αὐτάς, ὅπερ ἐστὶ λέγειν. [Ἐκάλουν δὲ καθόλου πάντα τὰ εἰς τοὺς ὑπερόντας γραφόμενα ὕμνους· διὸ καὶ τὸ προσόδιον καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ προειρημένα φαίνονται ἀντιδιαστέλλοντες τῷ ὕμνῳ ὡς εἴδη πρὸς γένος· καὶ γὰρ ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἀκούειν γραφόντων ὕμνος προσοδίου, ὕμνος ἐγκωμίου, ὕμνος παιᾶνος καὶ τὰ ὅμοια.

Ἐλέγετο δὲ τὸ προσόδιον ἐπειδὰν προσίωσι τοῖς βωμοῖς ἢ ναοῖς, καὶ ἐν τῷ προσιέναι ᾔδετο πρὸς αὐλόν· ὁ δὲ κυρίως ὕμνος πρὸς κιθάραν ᾔδετο ἑστώτων. Cf. SEVERYNS 1939, 40–42.113–125.

[17] WESTPHAL 1866, 243. Cf. SEVERYNS 1938, 172.

εὐκτικά, censés s'adresser aussi à des hommes, sont rangés dans le genre mixte.

Dans une description purement phénoménologique, on peut distinguer les hymnes selon plusieurs critères différents. Il est des hymnes de facture régulière, hexamétriques ou élégiaques (je n'en ai pas trouvé d'iambiques, mais rien ne s'y oppose)[18] ou de facture lyrique libre; il est des hymnes fortement associés à une pratique religieuse ou à un rite et il faut ranger parmi eux les hymnes homériques, préambules de cérémonies ou de récitations rhapsodiques[19]. Il en est de lyriques, monodiques ou choraux. Il en est qui relèvent, nonobstant quelque piété, du jeu littéraire (Callimaque) ou de l'amusement philosophique (Aristote, Cléanthe, Proclus, etc.). On ne sait dans tout cela où classer les hymnes orphiques et même les hymnes magiques. Tout dépend du sérieux, ou de la sincérité qu'on leur accorde. On peut enfin les classer selon leurs lieux d'origine ou de destination, selon les fêtes ou les rites auxquels ils sont associés, selon les divinités auxquelles ils sont adressés. Aucune de ces caractérisations ne prévaut ni ne peut prévaloir, tant est grande la variété de composition et de statut[20].

Aucune longueur fixe n'est assignée à quelque hymne que ce soit. Les hymnes connus peuvent compter un seul vers (par exemple réduit à un cri rituel: ἰὴ Παιάν) et jusqu'à 580 hexamètres (Hymne homérique à Hermès).[21]

---

[18] Même si Aristote tient l'iambe pour trivial, cf. e prosaïque: πλεῖστα γὰρ ἰαμβεῖα λέγομεν ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους (*Poétique* 1449a26); ὁ δ' ἴαμβος αὐτή ἐστιν ἡ λέξις ἡ τῶν πολλῶν, διὸ μάλιστα πάντων τῶν μέτρων ἰαμβεῖα φθέγγονται λέγοντες (Rhétorique III 8, 1408b33–36). Cf. aussi Démétrios, Περὶ λέξεως 43, qui reprend l'explication d'Aristote: ὁ δὲ ἴαμβος εὐτελὴς καὶ τῇ τῶν πολλῶν λέξει ὅμοιος. πολλοὶ γοῦν μέτρα ἰαμβικὰ λαλοῦσιν οὐκ εἰδότες.

[19] προοιμίον est le nom que Thucydide III 104, 4 et 5 donne à l'Hymne homérique en l'honneur d'Apollon.

[20] Normalement, le Péan s'adresse à Apollon – ou à Asclépios, son fils –, le dithyrambe à Dionysos, mais on connaît un Péan à Dionysos de Philodamos de Scarphée (POWELL 1925, 165, CADILI 1995, 200); on a même la trace d'un Péan d'Hermippe de Cyzique (?) à Antigone Monophthalmos et à Démétrios de Phalère (Athénée, Deipnosophistes XV 697A, CADILI 1995, 39) et d'un fragment de Péan à Séleucos (POWELL 1925, 140, CADILI 1995, 190–191). Le Péan à Séleucos suit, sur la pierre d'Érythrée, le fragment mutilé du Péan à Apollon/Asclépios (VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1909, 47).

[21] Le plus court des hymnes homériques est un hymne de 3 vers, à Déméter (XIII ALLEN/HALLIDAY/SIKES 1936):

Δήμητρ' ἠΰκομον σεμνὴν θεὰν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν,
αὐτὴν καὶ κούρην, περικαλλέα Περσεφόνειαν.

La forme idéale de l’hymne, quelle que soit sa longueur, comporte trois parties, chacune plus ou moins développée: 1. une invocation (ἐπίκλησις) 2. une eulogie (εὐλογία) qui peut prendre la forme d’un récit, d’une énumération de pouvoirs ou de mérites ou d’une justification de l’invocation 3. une prière proprement dite (εὐχή). Autour de ce noyau, on peut trouver des variations poétiques, euctiques ou eulogiques. L’auteur de l’hymne peut s’exhorter lui-même à chanter le dieu; il peut demander le secours des Muses, il peut jouer de la polyonymie, de la polysémie, de la multiplicité des pouvoirs et des fonctions du dieu.

Mais tout cela reste bien abstrait. Mieux vaut prendre quelques exemples pour réfléchir sur la forme et la signification de l’hymne à époque hellénistique (la plus proche des temps des textes bibliques et néo-testamentaires), étant entendu que les sources peuvent être directes (papyri, épigraphie) ou indirectes (recueils de textes tels que les Anthologies ou les recueils sciemment composés, citations d’auteurs divers).

Nous retiendrons l’hymne à Eros d’Antagoras de Rhodes (une composition littéraire du IIIe siècle avant notre ère), le Péan érythréen à Asclépios (texte épigraphique exemplaire, complet, de la première moitié du IVe siècle avant notre ère), le Péan érythréen à Apollon (de la même époque inscrit au verso de la même pierre et qui présente l’intérêt d’être précédé d’instructions rituelles).

1. L’hymne d’Antagoras à Éros

L’hymne à Éros d’Antagoras de Rhodes,[22] ami et auditeur du Platonicien Crantor de Soles, au IIIe siècle avant notre ère, se situe au croisement du jeu littéraire et de l’ἐπίδειξις philosophique. Diogène Laerce (Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres, IV 26) le cite à la fin de sa brève biogra-

---

Χαῖρε θεὰ καὶ τήνδε σάου πόλιν, ἄρχε δ’ ἀοιδῆς.

[22] Sur l’hymne cf. POWELL 1925, 120; VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1881, 69 suppose qu’Antagoras aurait résumé dans son hymne l’exposé qu’il aurait entendu de Crantor sur Éros. VON ARNIM 1922, 1586, le suit. FRASER 1972, 791, suggère qu’Antagoras a mis le poème dans la bouche de Crantor, ce que conteste LIVREA 1989, 26. Cf. aussi VON DER MÜHLL 1962; CADILI 1995, 41–43, qui m’a rendu les plus grands services dans la préparation de cette étude. DORANDI 1999, renvoie aussi à GIGANTE 1963, que je n’ai pu encore consulter. Cf. DORANDI 1994, 482–483. RENEHAN 1964, 380–381, apporte quelques précisions sur l’apparat de POWELL et sur les conjectures avancées par VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF à propos du passage, signale CADILI.

phie de Crantor, à qui certains ont attribué le poème, à l'évidence d'inspiration platonisante:

λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἀνταγόρα τοῦ ποιητοῦ ὡς Κράντορος εἰς Ἔρωτα πεποιημένα φέρεσθαι ταυτί·	On dit que circulaient aussi ces vers du poète Antagoras, tenus pour avoir été composés par Crantor:
Ἐν δοιῇ μοι θυμός, ὅ τοι γένος ἀμφιβόητον,[23]	"Mon âme est dans le doute, toi dont la naissance est disputée:
ἤ σε θεῶν τὸν πρῶτον ἀειγενέων, Ἔρως, εἴπω,	devrai-je te dire, Éros, le premier des dieux éternels,
τῶν ὅσσους Ἔρεβός τε πάλαι βασίλειά τε παῖδας	l'un des enfants qu'Érèbe et Nuit, la Reine,
γείνατο Νὺξ πελάγεσσιν ὑπ' εὐρέος Ὠκεανοῖο·	engendrèrent jadis sous les aires du vaste Océan,
ἤ σέ γε Κύπριδος υἷα περίφρονος, ἠέ σε Γαίης,	ou bien (te dirai-je) fils de la très sensée Cypris ou de Terre
ἢ Ἀνέμων· τοῖος σὺ[24] κακὰ φρονέων ἀλάλησαι	ou des Vents[25]: tel tu vagabondes, méditant des maux.

---

[23] La leçon ἀμφιβόητον des manuscrits BPF doit être conservée (contre ἀμφινόητον de V, ἀμφίσβητον de Meibom (avant Meibom, Marcovich 1999 nomme, de façon incompréhensible, Meineke [on ne trouve rien dans Meineke 1843]; Cobet 1878 et Marcovich 1999 le suivent; Wilamowitz 1881, 69 propose ἀμφήριστον, correction emprunté au vers 5 de l'Hymne à Zeus de Callimaque). Il faut entendre ἀμφιβόητον au sens de "dont on parle haut et fort de part et d'autre" (= célèbre). L'adjectif verbal ἀμφίσβητος n'est pas attesté ailleurs dans les textes. Ἀμφιβόητος l'est chez Callimaque (Hymne à Délos 303, "first in Callimachus", note Mineur 1984, 237; Cahen 1930, 210, voulait, dans le contexte, lui donner le sens de "[aux] deux sonorités, des voix qui chantent, des pieds qui frappent en cadence", ce qui ne convient guère à un dérivé de βοή. Il l'est aussi dans les *Epica Adespota* (*Encomium Iambicum* 1r, 22: ἀναμφιβόητον et Λόγος ἐπιβάτηριος 1*verso*, 34, Heitsch 1963, 91). Liddell/Scott/Jones 1996 glosent "sounding around", référence faite à Nonnos, *Dionysiaca* 45, 44, et "noised abroad", référence faite à l'*Anthologie Palatine* IX 24 (Antipater) et à Nonnos, Dionysiaca 26, 141. La connotation d'ambiguïté n'est pas exclue ici ("dont on parle haut et fort dans un sens et dans l'autre" = objet de controverses animées).

[24] Τοῖος σύ est la correction, vraisemblable, d'Estienne 1570, 149 et *annotatio* 19 (Marcovich 1999, 277, l'attribue indûment à Huebner, 1828–1831) pour le τοι αἶσα de BP (τοῖα ἶσα F: τοῖς ἶσα von der Mühll: jolie correction signifiant "à l'égal des vents"). Τοῖος σύ rappelle l'équivoque initiale (ἀμφιβόητος) et annonce la dualité finale (σῶμα δίφυιον). Les deux autres problèmes de texte, de moindre importance, sont la correction ἀνθρώποις (v. 7) de Jacobs 1820 et id. 1798, I, 2, 184, pour le ἀνθρώπων des manuscrits, et la graphie δίφυιον proposée par Hermann 1829 pour le δίφυον des manuscrits (vers 7).

ἀνθρώποις ἠδ᾽ ἐσθλά· τὸ καὶ σέο σῶμα δίφυιον.

pour les hommes et aussi des biens. Et ton corps est d'une double nature."

Conformément à l'une des formes du genre, le poète s'exhorte d'abord à affronter un doute, à expliciter une équivoque sinon la résoudre,[26] il

---

[25] Une scholie à Apollonios de Rhodes, Argonautiques III 26 résume diverses opinions sur la généalogie d'Éros: Ἀπολλώνιος μὲν Ἀφροδίτης τὸν Ἔρωτα γενεαλογεῖ, Σαπφὼ (fg. inc. lib. 198a VOIGT 1971) δὲ Γῆς καὶ Οὐρανοῦ, Σιμωνίδης δὲ Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Ἄρεως (PAGE 1962, fg. 70, 575 CAMPBELL 1991):

σχέτλιε παῖ δολόμηδες Ἀφροδίτας,
τὸν Ἄρῃ †δολο†μηχάνῳ τέκεν.

Ἴβυκος (PAGE 1962, fg. 43, 324 CAMPBELL 1991) <δὲ Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Ἡφαίστου>, ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος (Théogonie 116sqq.) ἐκ Χάους λέγει τὸν Ἔρωτα, ἐν δὲ τοῖς εἰς Ὀρφέα Χρόνου (fg. 360, BERNABE 2004):

αὐτὰρ Ἔρωτα Χρόνος καὶ πνεύματα πάντ᾽ ἐτέκνωσε.

"Apollonios fait d'Éros le fils d'Aphrodite; Sappho, celui de Terre et de Ciel; Simonide, celui d'Aphrodite et d'Arès: 'misérable inventeur de ruses, enfant d'Aphrodite, qu'elle a enfanté avec Arès l'ourdisseur de ruses (?)'; Ibykos <(le fait fils) d'Aphrodite et d'Héphaistos> (ajout de VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF), et dans les dits rapportés à Orphée, il est fils de Chronos: 'Alors Chronos engendra Éros et tous les souffles.' "

La scholie à Théocrite Idylle XIII 1–2, ajoute Akousilaos et Alcée, laissant entendre que l'on pourrait encore en ajouter d'autres: ἀμφιβάλλει, τίνος υἱὸν εἴπῃ τὸν Ἔρωτα Ἡσίοδος μὲν γὰρ Χάους καὶ Γῆς, Σιμωνίδης Ἄρεος καὶ Ἀφροδίτης, Ἀκουσίλαος Νυκτὸς καὶ Αἰθέρος (9B3DK), Ἀλκαῖος Ἴριδος καὶ Ζεφύρου (327 VOIGT 1971), Σαπφὼ Γῆς καὶ Οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλων. "Il hésite: de qui doit-il dire Éros être le fils; car Hésiode le dit celui de Chaos et de Terre; Simonide, celui d'Arès et d'Aphrodite; Akousilaos, celui de Nuit et d'Ether; Alcée, celui d'Iris et de Zéphyr; Sappho, celui de Terre et Ciel, et cetera." On peut encore ajouter Euripide (Hippolyte 534) qui le fait fils de Zeus:

οὔτε γὰρ πυρὸς οὔτ᾽ ἄστρων ὑπέρτερον βέλος
οἷον τὸ τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας ἵησιν ἐκ χερῶν
Ἔρως ὁ Διὸς παῖς (532–534)
"Il n'est pas de trait, ni du feu ni des astres, supérieur
à celui d'Aphrodite que lance de ses mains
Éros, l'enfant de Zeus".

Nonobstant l'intention allégorique, il ne faut pas oublier la généalogie que pose Diotime prêtresse de Mantinée, le faisant fils de pauvreté (πενία) et expédient (πόρος) ; Platon, Banquet 203a–204c. Pour l'ensemble des généalogies, cf. LASSERRE 1946. Antagoras s'inscrit dans ce jeu de disputes érudites.

[26] Le premier vers ressemble de très près au vers 5 de l'Hymne à Zeus de Callimaque: Ἐν δοιῇ μοι θυμός, ἐπεὶ γένος ἀμφήριστον "mon âme est dans le doute parce que sa naissance est dispute" (CAHEN 1930, 15 pensait y déceler une critique d'Antagoras et du mot mal forgé ἀμφίσβητον, correction contestable de MEIBOM. Il est vrai que HUTCHINSON 1988, 15 n. 26, date les débuts d'Antagoras de la fin du quatrième siècle avant notre ère. Rien n'assure toutefois que le poème d'Antagoras soit antérieur à celui

s'adresse directement au dieu dans le style du "tu" (*Du-Stil*) ou si l'on préfère de l'adresse à soi-même.

Le problème n'est pas celui de l'épiclèse, mais celui de la généalogie. Quatre traditions mythiques sont résumées dans l'eulogie:

(1) La première qui fait d'Éros "le premier des dieux toujours existants" (θεῶν τὸν πρῶτον ἀειγενέων, vers 2) fait référence implicitement au début du discours de Phèdre dans le Banquet de Platon (178a5–c2) et, partant, au fragment 28B13DK que cite Phèdre:

Le premier, comme je le dis, à parler, (selon ce que disait Aristodème) fut Phèdre qui commença à peu près à dire Éros est un grand dieu, étonnant chez les dieux et les hommes, de beaucoup de façons, mais la moindre n'est pas ce qui touche à sa naissance.

Car le fait que le dieu est des plus anciens est un honneur, disait-il; preuve en est qu'il n'a pas de géniteurs et que personne n'en parle que ce soit un particulier ou un poète. Mais Hésiode dit que d'abord est advenu Chaos, "puis Terre à la vaste poitrine, siège assuré de tout à jamais, et Éros".[27] Il dit donc qu'après le Chaos sont advenus ces deux-là: Terre et Éros. Et Parménide dit la naissance: "Le tout premier de tous les dieux, elle (*scilicet* la déesse de Parménide) pensa Éros".[28] Et Akousilaos[29] s'accorde avec

---

de Callimaque. On se trouve ici en présence de l'une de ces citations-variations auxquelles se plaisent les poètes. Mais on ne peut dire qui reprend l'autre (cf. aussi ARDIZZONI 1972, 415–418; LIVREA 1989, 24–31, me signale CADILI).

[27] Pour comprendre l'allusion de Phèdre, il faut lire tout le contexte d'Hésiode:

ἤτοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ'· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
ἀθανάτων οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,
Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῷ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης,
ἠδ' Ἔρος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι,
λυσιμελής, πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων
δάμναται ἐν στήθεσσι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν (Hes. theog. 116–122)

Tout d'abord il y eut chaos, et ensuite
Terre à l'ample poitrine, siège inébranlable toujours de tous
les immortels qui tiennent les sommets de l'Olympe neigeux,
et le Tartare brumeux dans la profondeur de la Terre aux larges chemins,
et Éros qui est le plus beau chez les dieux immortels,
qui délie les membres et dompte dans les poitrines l'esprit
de tous les dieux et de tous les hommes et leur vouloir sensé.

Si l'on peut considérer l'ensemble de la Théogonie (964 vers, en toute authenticité) comme un long hymne à tous les dieux, les vers 120–122 forment une eulogie particulière d'Éros.

[28] Sur ce vers (28B13DK) cf., en particulier BOLLACK 2006, 253–259.

[29] L'accord entre Akousilaos (9B1DK) et Hésiode ne peut être que superficiel si l'on en croit le témoignage de Damascius, Traité des premiers principes 124 (III, 163, 19, dans l'édition WESTERINK/COMBES 1991), rapportant l'opinion d'Eudème: Acousilaos y

Hésiode. Ainsi s'accorde-t-on, de beaucoup de parts, pour admettre qu'Éros est des plus anciens.[30]

Acousilaos, en effet, selon le témoignage d'Eudème de Rhodes, rapporté par Damascius, au VIe siècle de notre ère inventait un stade antérieur et faisait d'Éros, avec Éther et Intelligence, l'enfant d'Érèbe et de Nuit, les deux puissances de l'obscurité:

Akousilaos me semble supposer Chaos comme le premier principe en tant que totalement inconnaissable, puis les deux qui viennent après l'unique: Érèbe, le principe mâle, et le principe féminin, Nuit, celle-ci en lieu et place de l'infinitude, celui-là en lieu et place de la finitude; de leur union, dit-il, sont nés Éther, Éros et Intelligence, ces trois-là étant des hypostases intelligibles; il fait d'Éther la cime, d'Éros l'hypostase médiane, conformément à la médiéïté naturelle d'Éros et de la troisième l'intelligence selon ce qu'est maintenant la pensée très estimable. Et il introduit à leur suite, issus des mêmes, un grand nombre d'autres dieux, selon l'enquête d'Eudème[31].

---

fait d'Érèbe et de Nuit les parents d'Éros. Il est vrai que la scholie à Théocrite contredit Eudème-Damascius, faisant d'Éros le fils de Nuit et d'Éther. Cf. FOWLER 2000, Acousilaos 6a, b, c; DIELS/KRANZ 1956 amputent le texte de Damascius).

[30] Πρῶτον μὲν γάρ, ὥσπερ λέγω, ἔφη Φαῖδρον ἀρξάμενον ἐνθένδε ποθὲν λέγειν, ὅτι μέγας θεὸς εἴη ὁ Ἔρως καὶ θαυμαστὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις τε καὶ θεοῖς, πολλαχῇ μὲν καὶ ἄλλῃ, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν.

Τὸ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πρεσβύτατον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν τίμιον, ἦ δ' ὅς, τεκμήριον δὲ τούτου· γονῆς γὰρ Ἔρωτος οὔτ' εἰσὶν οὔτε λέγονται ὑπ' οὐδενὸς οὔτε ἰδιώτου οὔτε ποιητοῦ, ἀλλ' Ἡσίοδος πρῶτον μὲν Χάος φησὶ γενέσθαι

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα

Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεί,

ἠδ' Ἔρος

φησὶ δὴ μετὰ τὸ Χάος δύο τούτω γενέσθαι, Γῆν τε καὶ Ἔρωτα. Παρμενίδης δὲ τὴν γένεσιν λέγει

πρώτιστον μὲν Ἔρωτα θεῶν μητίσατο πάντων (28B13DK).

Ἡσιόδῳ δὲ καὶ Ἀκουσίλεως σύμφησιν. Οὕτω πολλαχόθεν ὁμολογεῖται ὁ Ἔρως ἐν τοῖς πρεσβύτατος εἶναι.

[31] Ἀκουσίλαος δὲ Χάος μὲν ὑποτίθεσθαί μοι δοκεῖ τὴν πρώτην ἀρχήν, ὡς πάντη ἄγνωστον, τὰς δὲ δύο μετὰ τὴν μίαν, Ἔρεβος μὲν τὴν ἄρρενα, τὴν δὲ θήλειαν Νύκτα, ταύτην μὲν ἀντὶ ἀπειρίας, ἐκείνην δὲ ἀντὶ πέρατος· ἐκ δὲ τούτων φησὶ μιχθέντων Αἰθέρα γενέσθαι καὶ Ἔρωτα καὶ Μῆτιν, τὰς τρεῖς ταύτας νοητὰς ὑποστάσεις, τὴν μὲν ἄκραν Αἰθέρα ποιῶν, τὴν δὲ μέσην Ἔρωτα κατὰ τὴν φυσικὴν μεσότητα τοῦ Ἔρωτος, τὴν δὲ τρίτην Μῆτιν, κατ'αὐτὸν ἤδη τὸν πολυτίμητον νοῦν. Παράγει δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν πολὺν ἀριθμὸν κατὰ τὴν Εὐδήμου ἱστορίαν (Damascius, Principes 124). L'exposé s'inscrit dans le chapitre sur la “Procession”, au milieu d'un ensemble de résumés des mythologies anciennes. Cf. Eudème de Rhodes, fragment 150 dans WEHRLI 1969, 70–72.

Antagoras ne soucie pas de la difficulté ni du risque de confusion. Il suppose simplement Érèbe et Nuit antérieurs aux dieux éternels (θεοί ἀειγενεῖς) et distincts d'eux.

L'exposé reformule la généalogie en terme de procession ontologique. Comme chez Hésiode, à l'origine s'ouvre Chaos l'insaisissable; comme chez Hésiode, viennent ensuite, sans la terre, deux puissances ténébreuses, l'Érèbe profond et la simple Nuit, qui engendrent ensemble la triade de l'Air lumineux, de l'Amour, qui se tient entre les êtres et les met en relation, et de l'Intelligence en qui tout se pense. Mais ceci, c'est l'interprétation allégorique de Damascius.

(2) La deuxième opinion, commune, fait d'Aphrodite la mère d'Éros. Antagoras ne s'y arrête pas. Il est inutile de s'y attarder, comme de s'attarder aux pouvoirs que lui a transmis sa mère et qui sont grands, dans l'ordre de toutes les séductions, puisqu'ils procèdent d'une intelligence supérieure (Κύπρις περίφρων).[32]

(3) La scholie à Apollonios, Argonautiques III 26b, nous l'apprend, c'est Sappho (198a VOIGT 1971) qui fait d'Éros un fils de Terre et d'Ouranos, donc un Titan, frère de Cronos, des Monts, des Nymphes, de Pontos et des autres, un être de violence que l'ordre de Zeus doit régler ou exclure.[33] Mais Pausanias nous l'apprend aussi: Sappho de Lesbos a chanté à l'endroit d'Éros beaucoup de chants qui ne s'accordent pas entre eux[34]. De fait, selon la scholie à Théocrite, Idylle 13, 1–2c, elle aurait fait naître Éros d'une union (combien incestueuse!) entre Aphrodite et Ouranos, conférant sans doute à Éros une double qualité céleste. Antagoras ne retient de la première version que la Terre seule.

(4) Ce n'est pas seulement la scholie à Théocrite, Idylle 13, 1–2c, qui nous apprend qu'Éros est fils du vent, mais surtout le fragment que cite Plutarque (Dialogue sur l'Amour 20, 765D–E), sans en préciser l'auteur, il est vrai, mais dont l'ensemble des témoins antiques et médiévaux attestent que ce ne peut être qu'Alcée[35]:

---

[32] Comme on sait, περίφρων est l'épithète mainte fois répétée de Pénélope dans l'Odyssée. Le TLG n'atteste aucune autre περίφρων Κύπρις.

[33] Cf., bien entendu, Hésiode Théogonie, 126–155a.

[34] Σαπφὼ δὲ ἡ Λεσβία πολλά τε καὶ οὐχ ὁμολογοῦντα ἀλλήλοις ἐς Ἔρωτα ᾖσε, Périégèse 9, 27, 3= 198c VOIGT 1971.

[35] Δεινότατον θέων
τὸν γένναт' εὐπέδιλος Ἶρις
χρυσοκόμαι Ζεφύρῳ μίγεισα

Le plus terrible des dieux
qu'engendra Iris aux belles sandales
unie à Zéphyr au cheveux d'or.

Iris, l'arc en ciel, la messagère ailée des dieux, n'est pas un vent, mais entre ciel et terre, elle est parmi eux, signifiant l'accalmie des intempéries, tandis que Zéphyr, le vent d'ouest tumultueux, apporte la pluie et la tempête. Leur fils ne peut qu'associer en lui la violence du père et la sérénité lumineuse de la mère.

A cette généalogie Éros doit de vagabonder entre les biens et les maux. D'elle il tient sa double nature, charnelle, partagée entre déchaînement et embellie. Même si Aphrodite n'est pas ici sa mère, il en conserve l'inventivité ingénieuse, dans le bien comme dans le mal (φρονέων, vers 6, fait écho à περίφρονος, vers 5).

L'eulogie fonctionne, sous la forme de généalogies, comme une doxographie, construisant un kaléidoscope où s'agencent les diverses conceptions d'Éros. Comme les discours du Banquet de Platon, ces conceptions se succèdent sans s'exclure absolument. Comme il manque au tableau l'amour éthéré de la tradition platonisante et la prière finale de la forme de l'εὐχή, on tient le poème pour incomplet. Il se peut que la fin en reste ouverte, laissant à l'auditeur la liberté de conclure lui-même, de choisir entre les deux natures d'Éros, entre l'impétuosité et la douceur.

Ainsi se développe, sous la forme de l'hymne le double jeu de la poésie et de l'ὑπόνοια philosophique.[36]

2. Le péan érythréen, égyptien de Ptolémaïs, athénien, macédonien de Dion, à Asclépios

On pourrait être tenté de retenir comme exemple d'hymne cultuel l'hymne crétois au Zeus du mont Dikté (inscription du IIIe siècle avant notre ère, découverte à Palaikastro), parce qu'il reflète une tradition qui remonte au

---

Alcée fg. 327 LOBEL/PAGE 1955, VOIGT 1971, LIBERMANN 1999. Il est inutile d'examiner en détail les témoins qui se recoupent les uns les autres: Etymologicum Gudianum sv ἵμερος 278, 19 STURZ = Etymologicum magnum sv ἵμερος, 470, 266 GAISFORD; Scholie T à l'Iliade XXIII 203 ERBSE; Eustathe, À l'Iliade I 616 et II 89 VAN DER VALK; Jean Lydus De Mensibus, 4, 154 WÜNSCH; Nonnus, Dionysiaques XXXI 110–111; Scholie in Parthenium, Ἀρήτης ἐπικήδειον, fr. 610 Supplementum Hellenisticum, LLOYD-JONES/PARSONS 1983, 292.

[36] J'évite le terme ἀλληγορία puisqu'au temps d'Antagoras il n'apparaît pas encore.

deuxième millénaire.[37] Malheureusement pour la démonstration, il comporte une lacune. Pour d'excellentes raisons, on pourrait en choisir d'autres, dont POWELL (1925), CADILI (1995), FURLEY/BREMER (2001) donnent des éditions intéressantes, mais la plupart présentent des lacunes ou des problèmes de lecture susceptibles de fixer l'attention. Le Péan à Asclépios, dit d'Érythrée, paraît, à la fois, complet, bien établi et suffisamment exemplaire. Il est attesté, avec des variantes minimes, par quatre témoins: une inscription trouvée dans l'Asclépeion d'Érythrée (milieu du IVe siècle avant notre ère, étudiée et éditée par VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1909, 37ss), une inscription trouvée à Ptolemais (aujourd'hui Menschieh) dans la Thébaïde, en Egypte (vers 97 de notre ère, éditée par BAILLET 1889, 70–83), un fragment trouvé dans l'Asclépeion d'Athènes (Ier ou IIe siècle de notre ère, IG III 1, 171C, 490), une inscription trouvée à Dion en Macédoine (IIe siècle de notre ère, éditée par OIKONOMOS 1915, 8ss).[38] La pluralité des témoins, étalés sur plusieurs

---

[37] *Editio princeps:* BOSANQUET/MURRAY 1908-1909; POWELL 1925, 136; EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1945, 327, n° 592; FURLEY/BREMER 2001, I, 68–76 et II, 1–20, l'éditent, le commentent et en donnent la bibliographie (CADILI 1995, 186–190).

[38] BÜLOW 1929, 35–47 a fait l'hypothèse que toutes ces versions dérivent d'un original composé à Athènes au IVe siècle avant notre ère, prenant pour preuve le développement, à cette époque, en ce lieu, du culte d'Akesô. EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1998, II, 88, n. 45, puis FURLEY/BREMER 2001, I, 213, n. 19 ont émis des réserves. Ceux-ci trouvent plus intéressante une autre suggestion de BÜLOW: le péan pourrait avoir pour auteur le poète dont le Pseudo-Lucien fait mention dans son Eloge de Démosthène § 27: οὐδὲ γὰρ τ' Ἀσκληπιῷ μεῖόν τι γίγνεται τῆς τιμῆς, εἰ μὴ τῶν προσιόντων αὐτῶν ποιησάντων †ὅπλα ἀναλισοδήμου† (†ὅπλα ἀναδησοδήμου† A) τοῦ Τροιζηνίου καὶ Σοφοκλέους ᾄδεται "Asclépios ne reçoit pas moins d'honneur si, sans que ceux qui s'approchent de lui composent eux-mêmes quelque chose, on chante [mot incompréhensible] de Trézène ou de Sophocle". L'incompréhensible †ὅπλα ἀναλισοδήμου† (†ὅπλα ἀναδησοδήμου† A) des manuscrits a été diversement corrigé: la Bipontine qui reprend le texte de REITZ 1743, imprime ᾄσματα, τὰ Ἀλισοδήμου (1791, IX, 156, avec une note de Solanus – M. du Soul –, 419: *hunc poetam ab aliis laudatum non memini*), leçon que reprend JACOBITZ 1839, III, 559, bien que HERMANN, par lui consulté, ait proposé ὁ παῖαν Αἰνησιδήμου. DINDORF 1842, 753, combine les deux lectures: ᾄσματα, ὁ παῖαν τὰ Ἀλισοδήμου. Dans son apparat de l'édition MACLEOD 1967, VIII, 268–269 l'editeur attribue à HARMON une nouvelle correction, qu'il adopte: ὁ παιάν, ἀλλ' Ἰσοδήμου (il signale aussi, sans épiloguer, une proposition de KEIL: Μεσοδήμου τοῦ ῥιζηνίου), puis dans MACLEOD 1980, III, 274, il simplifie: ὁ παιάν Ἰσοδήμου. Le nom Ἀλοσίδημος n'est pas attesté dans PAPE/BENSELER 1870, alors qu'Ἰσόδημος l'est. Bien que la correction, ultime, de MACLEOD paraisse raisonnable, on ne peut assurer ni que le pseudo Lucien mentionne un péan, *stricto sensu*, ni que l'auteur en soit un Isodémos de Trézène inconnu par ailleurs.

siècles, prouve la renommée et le grand usage de l'hymne en des sanctuaires multiples[39]:

[Παιᾶνα κλυτό]μητιν ἀείσατε (1)	Chantez [le Païan dont on glorifie] l'intelligence
[κοῦροι Λατοΐδαν Ἕκ]ατον,	[Jeunes gens, le fils de Léto], l'archer,
ἰὲ Παιάν,	Ié Païan,
ὃς μέγα χάρ[μα βροτοῖσ]ιν ἐγείνατο	qui a engendré une grande [joie pour les mortels],
μιχθεὶς ἐμ φι[λότητι Κορ]ωνίδι (5)	uni en [amour à Cor]onis,
ἐν γᾶι τᾶι Φλεγυείαι,	dans le pays de Phlégyas,
ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἀσκληπιὸν	Iè, Païan Asclépios,
δαίμονα κλεινό[τατ]ον,	divinité [très] illustre,
ἰὲ Παιάν,	Ié Païan,
[Το]ῦ δὲ καὶ ἐξεγένοντο Μαχάων	[de lui] sont nés aussi Machaon
καὶ Πο[δα]λείριος ἠδ' Ἰασώ,	et Po[da]lire, et Iasô,
ἰὲ Παιάν,	Ié Païan,
Αἴγλ[α τ'] ἐοῶπις Πανάκειά τε	et Aïgl[a] au beau regard et Panacée,
Ἠπιόνας παῖδες σὺν ἀγακλυτῶι	enfants d'Epioné avec la toute glorieuse,
ἐοαγεῖ Ὑγιείαι· (15)	la sainte Hygie,
ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἀσκληπιὸν	Iê Païan, Asclépios
δαίμονα κλεινότατον,	divinité très illustre,
ἰὲ Παιάν,	Ié Païan,
Χαῖρέ μοι, ἵλαος δ' ἐπινίσεο	tiens-moi en grâce, propice, viens
τὰν ἐμὰν πόλιν εὐρύχορον, (20)	jusqu'à ma cité aux vastes aires de danse,
ἰὲ Παιάν,	Ié Païan,
δὸς δ' ἡμᾶς χαίροντας ὁρᾶν φάος	et donne-nous la joie gracieuse de voir la lumière
ἀελίου δοκίμους σὺν ἀγακλυτῶι	du soleil, estimés, avec la toute glorieuse,
ἐοαγεῖ Υγιείαι·	la sainte Hygie,
ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἀσκληπιὸν (25)	Iè Païan, Asclépios
δαίμονα κλεινότατον,	divinité très illustre,
ἰὲ Παιάν.[40]	Ié Païan.

La poésie de l'hymne n'est pas des plus raffinées,[41] elle n'en est pas moins représentative de l'hymnique cultuelle.

[39] J'ai consulté les éditions de POWELL 1925, 136–137; CADILI 1995, 66C, 186–191; FURLEY/BREMER 2001, 6.1, I, 211–214; II, 161–167.

[40] Les restitutions sont appuyées par l'inscription de Caritza (Dion de Macédoine, éditée en 1915 par OIKONOMOS, reprise par POWELL 1925, 137) et par la stèle de Menschieh (BAILLET 1889).

[41] Le jugement de BAILLET 1889, 83, est sévère: "Si l'emploi du style noble et des mots poétiques ne suffit pas à constituer à nos yeux la poésie, encore moins le lyrisme, si nous exigeons plus d'invention, le péan de Menschieh n'obtiendra pas nos suffrages. Le

La métrique en est simple: ce sont des "dactyles lyriques". FURLEY/BREMER en proposent le schéma suivant:

– – – ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏖	4 dactyles
– – – ⏖ – ⏖ –	D2 (tétrapodie dactylique catalectique)
⏖ – –	Ionique
– ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏖	4 dactyles
– – – ⏖ – ⏖ – ⏖	4 dactyles
– – – ⏖ – –	tripodie dactylique (phérécratéen)
⏑ – ⏑ – x – ⏑ –	double dipodie iambique
– ⏖ – ⏖ –	D (hémiépès)
⏖ – –	Ionique

Le chant évolue en trois temps:

(1) exhortation faite au chœur de jeunes hommes de chanter Apollon qui a donné naissance à Asclépios,

(2) énumération de la progéniture d'Asclépios et de sa femme Épioné,

(3) prière finale, de liesse et de bonne santé.[42]

C'est un hymne choral, chanté et dansé (comme le suggère l'épithète εὐρύχορον donnée *in fine* à la cité, v. 20) par un chœur de jeunes hommes (κοῦροι, v. 2), apollinien, puisqu'il débute par la mention d'Apollon (Λατοΐδαν Ἕκατον)[43]. Le dieu est plus précisément dénommé au vers 2 par

---

souci prédominant que nous y signalions de la forme, du détail et du vocabulaire, aux dépens du fond, de la pensée, de la large inspiration, est un des caractères de l'alexandrinisme et le défaut qui devait le plus facilement attirer l'imitation des disciples. Ce péan présente donc un intérêt de curiosité, mais il ne ravira pas les amateurs de poésie. Nous nous figurons tout autres les péans perdus de Sophocle, de Simonide ou de Pindare."

[42] Le Péan de Macédonios à Apollon et Asclépios est de facture analogue (IG III 171b, 489, POWELL 1925, 138–140: pierre d'époque romaine trouvée à l'Asclépeion d'Athènes, mais l'hymne même peut être plus ancien).

[43] On peut aussi bien considérer Παιᾶνα, v.1, comme une première épiclèse d'Apollon lui-même que comme la désignation caractéristique de l'hymne et comprendre: "Chantez

son matronyme (Λατοΐδαν) et par l'une de ses épiclèses homériques (Ἕκατον).[44]

L'épithète κλυτόμητιν, confirmée par la pierre trouvée à Dion en Macédoine, n'est attestée ailleurs que dans l'Hymne homérique à Héphaïstos, v.1. C'est donc que le terme qualifie l'habileté pratique.[45]

Παιάν / Παιήων est d'abord une divinité guérisseuse. Le mot est attesté en Mycénien (pa-ja-wo-ne). C'est originellement un appellatif appliqué à une divinité. En Iliade V 401, Homère rappelle que Παιήων a soigné Hadès blessé par Arès. En Iliade V 899–900, le même Παιήων soigne Arès blessé par Diomède. En Odyssée IV 232, Homère raconte que les médecins d'Egypte descendent de Παιήων.[46]

Païan…, le Létoïde, le bienveillant…" ou "Chantez le Péan, <chantez> le Létoïde, le bienveillant", avec un double accusatif, celui de la forme interne et celui de l'objet.

[44] Iliade I 385, VI 83, XX 71 & 295. On peut se demander si l'épiclèse n'est pas le masculin d'Ἑκάτη. CHANTRAINE 1970, 328, avoue que le terme est obscur; il rapproche ἑκηβόλος de ἑκών et propose de l'interpréter au sens de "qui tire à son gré". Ἕκατος, isolé, pourrait alors signifier "le bien dispose", soulignant la libre volonté bienveillante du dieu.

[45] Plus tardivement, κλυτόμητις (ou κλυτομήτης) est attesté, selon LIDDELL/SCOTT/JONES 1996, dans les *Imagines* de Philostrate le Jeune 13 (884, 33 Olearius; le court texte est une adresse à une figuration de Sophocle entouré d'abeilles): Ἀσκληπιὸς δέ, οἶμαι, οὗτος ἐγγὺς παιᾶνά που παρεγγυῶν γράφειν καὶ κλυτομήτης οὐκ ἀπαξιῶν παρὰ σοῦ ἀκοῦσαι βλέμμα τε αὐτοῦ πρὸς σὲ φαιδρότητι μεμιγμένον τὰς [παρὰ] μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐπιξενώσεις αἰνίττεται. "Asclépios, je pense, est celui qui, tout près, (te) prescrit d'écrire un péan et, célèbre pour son intelligence, ne dédaigne pas (d'en) écouter (un) de toi; le regard qu'il porte sur toi, mêlé de gaîté, donne à deviner les visites (qu'il te rendra) un peu plus tard". Peut-on en déduire (comme le fait PAGE 1962, 380), que le mot figurait dans le *Péan* de Sophocle à Asclépios? Cf. aussi l'*Anthologie planudéenne* (4, 43 = Anthologie grecque 16, 43; AUBRETON/BUFFIERE 1980, 99) à propos d'un juge, l'Anthologie grecque I 9 (WALTZ 1928, 15) et l'Appendix: Epigrammata dedicatoria 357, 3, 58; Epigrammata sepulcralia, 711, 3, 210; Epigrammata demonstrativa 185, 3, 322; Epigrammata exhortatoria et sepulcralia 28, 1, 395 (ed. COUGNY 1890).

[46] Cf. KÄPPEL 1992; id. 2000; SCHRÖDER 1999. "Παιάων qui est à l'origine de tout le système [i.e. lexical], est à la fois le nom d'un dieu et le cri par lequel on le salue", Παιήων est le nom d'un dieu médecin (*Iliade*, Pindare), titre et, finalement, nom d'Apollon sous la forme Παιάν (Aesch. *Ag.* 146 etc.) ou Παιών (Platon, etc.)", résume Chantraine 1974, 846. Cf. aussi l'analyse que Severyns 1939, 41, 125–130, donne du texte de Proclus (codex 239 de Photius).

Sur la nature et la forme originelle du dieu Παιήων cf. notamment les scholies véronaises à Virgile *Énéide* 10, 738, BASCHERA 1999, 125.13–15: Zenodotus (*i.e. Mallotes*, ὁ Κρατήτειος = PUSCH 1890, 153–154) *in eo quem inscribitur* Παιηονίαν [*histo*]*riam* [*sed idem iam coniecit O. Wachsmuth ap. Federici Osann Quaestiones Homericas, I, Ind. Lection. Grifiswaldensium, 1851, p. 19*], ΠΕΙΤΟΝΙΗΝ cod. Veron.,

En Iliade I 473–474, quand Agamemnon a accepté de renvoyer Chryséis, les Achéens festoient et "tout le jour, les jeunes Achéens apaisèrent les dieux par un chant, le beau péan, chantant le Préservateur".[47] Le mot est ici compris comme désignant le chant de liesse. Il pourrait aussi, avec la même équivoque, être une épiclèse d'Apollon, tout comme Ἑκάεργον.

Païan est aussi le cri auquel s'exhortent les Couroi de l'hymne érythréen.

L'eulogie commence avec l'évocation de la naissance d'Asclépios, désigné par une métonymie du concret à l'abstrait comme "grande joie pour les mortels" (μέγα χάρ[μα βροτοῖσ]ιν). Les relations des humains avec la médecine sont de l'ordre de la grâce (χάρις), réjouissance dans un monde de souffrances.[48] La précision "dans le pays de Phlégyas" (ἐν γᾶι τᾶι Φλεγυείαι) ferait-elle allusion aux environs thessaliens d'Érythrée[49]?

Les vers 7–9, 16–18, 25–27 forment trois refrains à la fin de chaque strophe. Le cri du péan (ἰὴ / ἰὴ Παιάν), répété, encadre l'invocation réduite à l'expression la plus simple: le nom propre à l'accusatif (Ἀσκλήπιον) et une qualification des plus communes "démon très glorieux" (δαίμονα κλεινότατον), étant entendu que δαίμων, rapproché de δαίομαι "partager", désigne la "puissance qui attribute".[50]

Παιανίην *Mai*; *fort.* Παιονικὴν ἱστορίαν, *altero verbo in sermonem converso Latinum aut post scholium confectum addito ad mendosam Graecam lectionem explicandam*) *sub nomine Naucratis* [*Naucrates, Aristarchii discipulus = F. Alexander, Naukrates (n. 2), RE 16, 2 (1935), 1954*] *facit disser*[*ere*] *Aristarchios, qui putant alium Paeana esse, alium Apollinem; ipse eundem nec diver*[*sum*] *multis docet*.

[47] Οἱ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπῇ θεὸν ἱλάσκαντο / καλὸν ἀείδοντες παιήονα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν μέλποντες Ἑκάεργον. Le vers 474 avait été athétisé sous le prétexte que quelqu'un l'aurait ajouté, pensant qu'Apollon était dit Païéôn; scholie A à 474: ἀθετεῖται ὅτι νομίσας τις τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα Παιήονα εἰρῆσθαι προσέθηκεν αὐτὸν. Aristarque faisait de καλόν un adverbe portant sur ἀείδοντες.

[48] L'Hymne homérique à Asclépios (XVI), qui évoque, lui aussi, l'union d'Apollon et de Coronis dans la plaine de Dotion, qualifie, lui aussi, l'événement de χάρμα μέγ' ἀνθρώποισι, complété par l'antithèse κακῶν θελκτῆρ' ὀδυνάων (vers 4). On le sait, Pindare développe le mythe d'Apollon et Coronis dans sa 3e Pythique, 1–46 (complété par l'histoire d'Asclépios lui-même, aux vers 47–69, pour souhaiter la guérison de Hiéron le Syracusain).

[49] La suppression de ἐν γᾶι dans les versions d'Athènes, de Dion et de Ptolémaïs pourrait confirmer l'hypothèse, τᾶι Φλεγυείαι signifiant alors simplement que Coronis appartient à la mouvance du héros Phlégyas. Des variations, notamment locales peuvent s'insérer dans l'hymne.

[50] Cf. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1931, I, 363; CHANTRAINE 1968, 246ff.; DUMEZIL 1977, 109.

La seconde strophe énumère les enfants d'Asclépios, d'abord les deux médecins héroïques de l'Iliade, Machaon et Podalire.[51] On fait, en général de Machaon plutôt un chirurgien et de Podalire un praticien, pratiquant le régime de vie. On étymologise parfois Machaon par rapprochement avec μάχαιρα "le coutelas" ou avec *μάχω "combattre" (qu'inventent les étymologistes: Etymologicum Magnum, 574, 254 Gaisford, sv μάχη).

Podalire, lui, est joliment étymologisé par rapprochement avec le nom du lis (λείριον): τὸ τοῖς ποσὶν λείρια ἐπιτιθέναι "poser des lis sur les pieds", ou par τὸ ἔχειν τὸν πόδα λείριον ἤγουν ἁπαλὸν "avoir un pied de lis, c'est à dire tendre" ou encore, à l'opposé, par ἀλείριος "qui n'a rien d'un lis".[52]

---

[51] Iliade II 729–733; XI 833–836, Machaon et Podalire ensemble; Iliade IV 192–219; XI 504–520, 596–615, 643–652; XIV 1–8, Machaon seul. EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1945, 65–105, répertorient les références dans la littérature antique. Quintus de Smyrne, Posthomerica VI 390–413, raconte la mort de Machaon, tué par Eurypyle, fils de Télèphe et ses funérailles en VII 1–47, 58–65, 87–92. La scholie à Lycophron, Alexandra, 480, raconte que Podalire s'est exilé pour finalement mourir en Italie. Le plus souvent leur mère est Epioné, mais ce peut être aussi, selon d'autres témoignages, Arsinoé, Xanthé ou Lampétia.

[52] Etymologicum Gudianum (331, 12–13, DE STEFANI, Leipzig, BT, 1909-1920): sv Δαΐφρων·… λέγεται δὲ [ὁ Μαχάων, l'erreur sur le nom même est pour le moins surprenante!] παρὰ τὸ τοῖς ποσὶ λείρια ἐπιτιθέναι, ὃ σημαίνει τὰ ἄνθη· ἰατρὸς γάρ. Un peu plus loin, l'étymologie est répétée, d'abord plus succinctement: λείριον·… ἐξ οὗ (λειρίου) καὶ Ποδαλείριος, ὁ ποδῶν ἰατρός (Etymologicum Gudianum, 364, 59), puis, plus prolixement, sous deux rubriques successives: 1. Ποδαλείριος, οἱ μὲν παρὰ τὸν πόδα, καὶ τὸ ἀλείριος, τοῦτ' ἔστι τοὺς πόδας κληροὺς (pour σκληροὺς ?) ἔχειν· οἱ δὲ παρὰ τοῖς ποσὶ λείρια ἐπιτιθέναι, ἅ ἐστιν ἄνθη· καὶ εἰς τὸ δαΐφρων (ceci est un renvoi à la rubrique δαΐφρων citée supra). 2. Ποδαλείριος, κύριον, διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου γράφεται· παρὰ γὰρ τὸ λείριον γέγονεν, ὅπερ δέδεικται. διαφόρως δὲ τοῦτο σχηματίζουσιν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ λέγουσιν ὅτι Ποδαλείριος λέγεται, ὁ ἔχων τὸν πόδα λείριον ἦγον (ἤγουν ?) ἁπαλὸν, ἄτοπον δέ ἐστιν ἥρωος πόδα λέγειν ἁπαλόν· ἕτεροι δὲ λέγουσιν, ὅτι παρὰ τὸ λείριον τὸ ἁπαλὸν γέγονεν ἀλείριον, τῆς α στερήσεως προσελθούσης, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν τὸ Ποδαλείριος, παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν τὸν πόδα παρὰ τὰ λείρια, ἤγουν παρὰ τὰ ἄνθη, βοτανικὸν γὰρ καὶ ἰατρικὸν τοῦτο (Etymologicum Gudianum, 471, 24–30).

L'Etymologicum Magnum ne difère guère de l'Etymologicum Gudianum: οἱ μὲν λέγουσι παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν τὸν πόδα λείριον, ἤγουν ἁπαλόν· ἄτοπον δὲ ἥρωος πόδα λέγειν ἁπαλόν. Οἱ δὲ λέγουσι κατὰ στέρησιν ἀλείριος, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν Ποδαλείριος· οἷον, ὁ τοὺς πόδας μὴ ἔχων ἁπαλοὺς, ἀλλὰ σκληρούς. Κρεῖττον δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν τοὺς πόδας περὶ τὰ λείρια, ἤγουν περὶ τὰ ἄνθη· βοτανικὸν γὰρ ἰατρὸν τοῦτον ἡμῖν ὑποτίθησιν· "Les uns disent (que le mot) dérive de l'expression 'avoir un pied de lis'; mais il est absurde de dire tendre le pied d'un héros. les autres disent, négativement 'qui n'a rien du lis' et, à partir de là 'Podalire'; par exemple 'celui qui n'a pas les pieds tendres, mais rêches'. Il vaut mieux (le faire) dériver de l'expression 'avoir les pieds dans les lis', c'est à dire

Trois filles sont nommées (Αἴγλα, Πανάκεια, Ὑγίεια).[53] Αἴγλα "l'éclatante", symbolise la lumière qui va de pair avec la bonne santé, l'état et l'aspect florissant de l'être que n'affecte pas la maladie.[54] Elle est, avant toute médecine, l'idéal de tout être humain.

Le bel aspect est signalé dans l'épithète ἐοῶπις, qui peut aussi bien avoir un sens passif ("belle à voir"), qu'un sens actif ("au beau regard"), aucun n'excluant l'autre.

Πανάκεια signifie proprement "le remède universel", qui soigne toutes les maladies.[55] Plutôt qu'une hypostase d'Asclépios, E. et L. EDELSTEIN veulent voir en elle comme en ses sœurs, une extension du pouvoir curatif. La distinction paraît superflue. Est associée à Asclépios, lorsque la bonne santé florissante cède la place à la maladie, la capacité de donner remède à tout sans exception, sinon à la mort (comme le montre la fin d'Asclépios dans la troisième *Pythique* de Pindare).[56]

Seule des trois filles, Πανάκεια ne reçoit pas ici une épithète précise.

Si Αἴγλα est la bonne santé rayonnante, Πανάκεια le remède aux maladies, Hygie (Ὑγίεια), la troisième fille, peut être la santé recouvrée ou maintenue par l'intervention préventive ou curative de la technique médicale.[57] Si Αἴγλη s'applique à l'aspect extérieur, Ὑγίεια s'applique plus précisément au mode d'être, à l'équilibre vital.[58]

---

dans les fleurs; car (cela) nous suggère que celui-ci est un médecin botaniste (*Etymologicum Magnum*, 678, 17–26)."

[53] Manquent Ἀκεσώ et Ἰασώ (le soin médical), mais Πανάκεια les subsume toutes deux.

[54] EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1945, II, 90 détaillent les interprétations qui ont été données d'Αἴγλα, la plus jeune fille d'Asclépios, avant que soit nommée au Ve siècle avant notre ère, Hygie. Elle serait d'abord une déesse de la lumière ; USENER 1895, 164–165). Elle pourrait aussi symboliser la sagesse d'Asclépios (Isyllos, Péan 46 et 53, AA, 134, en fait la mère même d'Asclépios, de sorte qu'on a voulu lui voir une origine épicurienne).

[55] Cf. EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1945, II, 87–89; THRAEMER 1902, lui donne une origine rhodienne, indépendante d'Asclépios.

[56] CHANTRAINE 1968, 49f. distingue ἄκος (et ἀκεῖσθαι) de ἰᾶσθαι en ce que ἀκεῖσθαι ne se rapporte pas au nom du médecin (ἰατρός) et n'a pas pour complément le nom de la personne soignée, mais le nom de la souffrance ou de la blessure. Même si le terme peut être tenu pour technique, il dénote l'idée d'apaisement (voir DE LAMBERTERIE 2009, 1268).

[57] EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1945, II, 89 et note 51, qui considèrent qu'elle est associée à Asclépios à partir de 400 avant notre ère. USENER 1895, 167, lui suppose une origine athénienne, ce qui devient ensuite l'opinion commune.

[58] CHANTRAINE 1977, 1150–1151, rappelle l'accord des étymologistes: le mot repose sur la composition d'un terme **su* (bien connu en indo-iranien), signifiant "bien" et de *g^{W}iyê (le radical de ζῆν "vivre"). Ὑγίεια (ou ὑγιείη / α), c'est donc le *bien vivre*.

Aucune de ces filles ne fait l'objet d'un mythe propre. Leur association détaille les capacités de leur père.

Les deux épithètes d'Hygie pourraient, par syllepse, s'appliquer aux trois sœurs. Toutes trois, par leur bienfaisance, méritent la plus haute gloire (ἀγακλύτῳ) et sont saintes (ἐοαγεῖ), c'est à dire "en bon rapport avec le sacré": infiniment précieuses, elles ne peuvent qu'être pures, objets de révérence, voire d'interdits.[59] Sous l'énigme du qualificatif s'exprime le pouvoir exceptionnel et admirable de la divinité.

La mère des trois filles et aussi, dans la tradition dominante, des deux fils, Ἠπιονή, n'a aucune personnalité propre.[60] La scholie A à Iliade IV 195

---

[59] Voir les deux articles, indécis, ἄγος et ἅζομαι de CHANTRAINE 1968, 13 et 25–26. En ressort (quelle que soit la raison de la psilose de ἄγος) l'idée que ce qui est qualifié de εὐαγής, d'ἅγιος ou d'ἁγνος ne peut qu'être l'objet d'interdits, en raison de sa nature ou de son statut supérieur, cf. e surnaturel.

[60] Pour EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1998, 85–86, Epioné est considérée comme la femme d'Asclépios depuis la fin du Ve siècle. Elle ne vit que dans son union avec son époux et, apparemment, en est simplement un double. Son nom dérive de ἤπιος, qui signifie "doux" quand on parle du temps ou des circonstances, "bienveillant" quand on parle des êtres vivants. Cornutus, De Natura Deorum (LANG 1881, 71, 3) étymologise le nom d'Épioné par "la vertu apaisante des remèdes": Ἠπιόνη, τοῦ ὀνόματος οὐκ ἀργῶς εἰς τὸν μῦθον παρειλημμένου, δηλοῦντος δὲ τὸ πραϋντικὸν τῶν ὀχλήσεων διὰ τῆς ἠπίου φαρμακείας. Le pseudo Hippocrate la dit fille d'Héraclès (Lettre 10, 51). Cf. aussi Ælius Aristide, Ἀσκληπιάδαι, 46, 5 Jebb; Pausanias, Périégèse II 29, 1; Maxime l'astrologue (II-IVe siècle de notre ère) Περὶ Καταρχῶν 6, l. 207; la Souda sv (η 435); l'Etymologicum Magnum, 434, 18 GAISFORD.

Les *Etymologica* byzantins étymologisent Asclépios de cinq façons: 1. par ἤπιος (seul): Ἤπιος: Οὕτως πρότερον ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ Ἀσκληπιός· ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν τρόπων, ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης καὶ τῆς τῶν χειρῶν ἠπιότητος· ᾧ καὶ γυναῖκα παραδίδωσιν Ἠπιόνην, ἐξ ἧς αὐτῷ γενέσθαι Ἰάσονα, Πανάκειαν (Etymologicum Magnum, GAISFORD 1848, 434, 15-19); 2. par σκέλος (jambe) + σκέλλω (faire dessécher), ξηραίνω (sécher): ὅθεν καὶ Ἀσκληπιός, ὁ μὴ ἐῶν τὰ σκέλη ἐσκληκέναι καὶ ξηραίνεσθαι· ἀπὸ δὲ μέρους τὸ (5) ὅλον σῶμα δηλοῖ (Etymologicum Genuinum, LASSERRE-LIVARADAS 1992, 1281 4-6); 3. par σκέλος + ἤπιος + σκληρός ou ἀσκελής: Ἀσκληπιός· παρὰ τὸ τὰ σκέλη ἤπια ποιεῖν, ἢ ἀπὸ μέρους ὅλον τὸ σῶμα· ἀσκεληποιὸς οὖν ἐστὶ, καὶ συγκοπῇ Ἀσκληπιός. (Orion, STURZ 1820, 15, 8-10); Ἀσκληπιός· παρὰ τὸ τὰ σκέλη ἤπια ποιεῖν· ἀπὸ μέρους δὲ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα. ἢ ὁ τὰ ἄγαν σκληρὰ ἤπια ποιῶν (Etymologicum Gudianum, DE STEFANI 1909); Ἀσκληπιός· εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ τὰ ἀσκελῆ τῶν νοσημάτων (24) ἤπια ποιεῖν· <ἀσκελές γὰρ τὸ σκληρόν> (Etymologicum Symeonis, LASSERRE/LIVARADAS 1992, 248, 24-25) 4. par σκληρός, σκέλλω, ἀσκελής, ξηραίνω: καὶ Ἀσκληπιός, ὁ μὴ ἐῶν ἐσκληκέναι, ἤτοι ξηραίνεσθαι καὶ ἀποθανεῖν τῶν θεραπευομένων τὰ σώματα (Orion, STURZ 1820, 9, 15-17); Ἀσκληπιός, ὁ τὰ ἄγαν σκληρὰ ἤπια ποιῶν, τοῦ α ἐπίτασιν σημαίνοντος (Orion, STURZ 1820, 30, 12-13); καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸς ὁ μὴ ἐῶν ἐσκληκέναι ⟦τῶν⟧ θεραπευομένων τὰ ⟦σώματα⟧ (Etymologicum Gudianum, DE STEFANI 1909, 213, 12); Ἀσκληπιός· ὁ ⟦τὰ⟧ ἄγαν σκληρὰ

dénomme la mère de Machaon Arsinoé (Ἀρσινόη) et dit qu'Hésiode la nommait Ξάνθη. À ces noms s'ajoutent Ἀριστοδάμα (Pausanias, Périégèse II 10, 3), Λαμπέττεια τῆς Ηλίου, fille d'Hélios (Scholie au Ploutos d'Aristophane, 701), Ἱππονόη (Jean Tzétzès, Homerica 615) et Ὑγίεια elle-même (Hymne orphique LXVII 7, compliquant encore les relations familiales).

La troisième strophe constitue l'envoi[61]: le salut (χαῖρε) et la demande (δός). La présence du dieu est sollicitée, dans la cité même d'Érythrée, d'Athènes, de Dion, de Ptolemaïs ou de toute autre ville, au milieu des danses rituelles.

Grâce pour grâce (χαίροντας fait écho à χαῖρε), l'éclat de la santé doit être sauvegardé ou rétabli. Φαός ἀελίου rappelle Αἴγλα, gloire pour gloire, δοκίμου répond en mineur à κλεινότατον et ἀγακλυτῷ et annonce la reprise littérale σὺν ἀγακλυτῷ ἐοαγεῖ Ὑγιείᾳ.

⟦ἤπια⟧ ποιῶν, τοῦ α ἐπίτ⟦ασιν⟧ σημαίνοντος. Ἀσκληπιός, ὁ τὰ σκέλη καὶ π⟦ᾶν⟧ τὸ σῶμα ὑγιὲς ⟦ποιῶν⟧ καὶ ἀνώδυνον. ⟦οὕτως Ἡρωδιανός⟧ (Etymologicum Gudianum, De Stefani 1909, 213, 16-18); ὅθεν καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸς, ὁ μὴ ἐῶν τὰ σκέλη ἐσκληκέναι καὶ ξηραίνεσθαι· ἀπὸ μέρους δὲ τὸ ὅλον σῶμα δηλοῖ. Καὶ γὰρ τὸν Ἐπιδαύρου (45) τύραννον ὀφθαλμιῶντα θεραπεύσας, ἐκλήθη Ἀσκληπιός· πρότερον γὰρ Ἤπιος ἐκαλεῖτο. Ἢ ὅτι τὰ ἀσκελῆ (ὅ ἐστι σκληρὰ) τῶν νοσημάτων ἤπια ποιεῖ (Etymologicum magum, Gaisford 1848, 154, 43-48, sv ἀσκελές); 5. par Ἄσκλην (tyran supposé d'Épidaure), ἤπιος et ἀσκελής: Ἀσκληπιός· (εἴρηται, ὅτι Ἄσκλην τὸν Ἐπιδαύρου τύραννον ὀφθαλμιῶντα θεραπεύσας ἐκλήθη Ἀσκληπιός·) πρότερον γὰρ (Ἀσκληπιός) Ἤπιος ἐκαλεῖτο. ἢ ὅτι τὰ ἀσκελῆ τῶν νοσημάτων ἤπια ποιεῖ· ἀσκελῆ δὲ τὰ σκληρά (Etymologicum Genuinum, Lasserre/Livaradas 1992, 1280, 2-4); cf. aussi supra Gaisford 1848, 154, 45-48.

Un scholiaste de l'*Iliade* étymologise Ἀσκλήπιος par ἀσκεῖν (scholie A à l'*Iliade* IV 195: Ξάνθη· Μαχάων δὲ οὗτος υἱὸς ᾿Ασκληπίου καὶ ᾿Αρσινόης κατὰ δὲ ῾Ησίοδον Ξάνθης (fr. 53 MW). ᾿Ασκληπιὸς δὲ εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ ἀσκεῖν καὶ ἤπια τὰ μέλη ποιεῖν.]

[61] Il est inutile de supposer une suite obligée de l'hymne, même s'il peut recevoir des extensions conjoncturelles comme la version trouvée à Ptolémaïs-Menschieh (apparat de Powell 1925, 138, ad 27):

Νείλου δὲ ῥοὰς δώῃς, μάκαρ ἀϊδίους
καὶ τᾷδε πόλει θάλος ἀμβροσίον,
πάσῃ δ' ἀγαθὸν κλεὸς Αἰγύπτῳ.
Χαῖρε μοι, ὦ Παιὰν, ἐπ' ἐμαῖς εὔφροσι ταῖσδ' ἀοιδαῖς.
χαῖρ' ὦ Πύθι' Ἄπολλον.

Donne, bienheureux, des flots perpétuels au Nil
Et à cette cité une prospérité éternelle
Et à toute l'Egypte une douce gloire
tiens-moi en grâce, ô Péan, pour mes chants dévots réjouissants.
Salut! ô Apollon Pythien!

[62] Si j'en crois l'apparat de Powell 1925, on lit, sur la pierre d'Erythrée, δόκιμον (portant alors sur φάος), tandis que, sur celles d'Athènes, de Dion et de Ptolemaïs, on lit

L'hymne s'achève plus habilement (ou plus ludiquement) qu'il n'avait commencé. Le but est peut-être d'abord la santé, il est aussi, plus simplement, la célébration. Le jeu mythologique sur les relations généalogiques et le jeu poétique sur les noms et les mots n'en sont pas exclus.

3. Le péan érythréen à Apollon

Les inscriptions épigraphiques attestent parfois l'association de l'hymne et de rites, voire de danses rituelles, comme on le voit sur l'une des pierres anciennes d'Érythrée, ancienne, datée des années 380–360 avant notre ère.[63] Elle témoigne des rites pratiqués à cette époque[64]:

(l. 25) Ὅταν δὲ ἡ πόλις τὴν θυσίην τῷ	Lorsque la cité accomplit le sacrifice à
Ἀσκληπίῳ ποιῇ, τὰ τῆς πόλεως	Asclépios, que les offrandes de la cité soient
προτεθύσθαι ὑπὲρ πάντων, ἰδιώτης δὲ	sacrifiées les premières en faveur de tous, et
μηδεὶς προθυέτω ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, ἀνὰ δὲ	qu'aucun particulier ne sacrifie le premier au
τὸν ἄλλογ χρόνον προθυέτω κατὰ τὰ	cours de la fête; en un autre temps, qu'il
προγεγραμμένα[65]· ὅσοι δὲ	sacrifie le premier selon les prescriptions
ἐγκατακοιμηθέντες θυσίην ἀποδιδῶσι	susdites. Que ceux qui, après avoir incubé,
τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἢ	offrent un sacrifice à Asklépios et à Apollon
ἑοξάμενοι θυσίην ἀποδιδῶσιν, ὅταν	ou, après avoir prié, offrent un sacrifice, (que
τὴν ἱρὴν μοῖραν ἐπιθῇ, παιωνίζειν	ceux-là), au moment où l'on dépose la part
πρῶτον περὶ τὸμ βωμὸν τὸν	sacrée, chantent d'abord un péan autour de
Ἀπολλῶνος τόνδε τὸμ παιῶνα ἐστρίς·	l'autel d'Apollon, trois fois ce péan:
ἰὴ Παιών, ὤ, ἰὴ Παιών	Iê péan, oh! Iê péan
ἰὴ Παιών, ὤ, ἰὴ Παιών,	Iê péan, oh! Iê péan
ἰὴ Παιών, ὤ, ἰὴ Παιών	Iê péan, oh! Iê péan
[ὦ] ἄναξ Ἄπολλον, φείδεο κούρων	Oh seigneur Apollon épargne les jeunes

δοκίμους (portant alors sur ἡμᾶς). La variante montre que la lettre du texte pouvait flotter. Finalement, la leçon d'Erythrée paraît la plus riche de sens: il est bien que les dévots reconnaissent le mérite de la lumière du Soleil.

[63] Éditions: VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1909, 37ss; PAGE 1968, 501; POWELL 1925, 140; CADILI 1995, 66A, 183 (sur la même pierre que le Péan à Asclépios, au *verso*): le texte le plus complet que j'ai trouvé du début de l'inscription se lit dans EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1945, 295, n° 521.

[64] Cf. CADILI 1995, 184, n° 707.

[65] Dans les premières lignes très mutilées du début de l'inscription, étaient précisées les prescriptions rituelles, supposent EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1945, 295, n 2.

	hommes
φείδ[εο[66]	épargne…

L'hymne proprement dit se réduit à une mélopée et à une brève invocation tronquée:

ἰὴ Παιών, ὤ, ἰὴ Παιών
ἰὴ Παιών, ὤ, ἰὴ Παιών
ἰὴ Παιών, ὤ, ἰὴ Παιών
[ὦ] ἄναξ Ἄπολλον, φείδεο κούρων
φείδ[εο

Dans la formule initiale, trois fois dite, la triplication renforçant l'efficacité des paroles et la solennité, Apollon est invoqué d'abord sous l'épiclèse protectrice Παιών, puis il reçoit sa dénomination olympienne courante: Ἄπολλον. Sous la prière trop brève en son état actuel, invitant à épargner les jeunes gens (φείδεο κούρων), se dessine un péan plutôt belliqueux. On ne comprend pas pourquoi des incubés (vraisemblablement de tous âges) solliciteraient seulement une protection pour des jeunes gens. On peut supposer qu'ils entonnent un cantique connu, dont on ne met pas en question la pertinence dans un contexte curatif.

Dans les instructions du préambule, la distinction soigneusement rappelée entre le rite collectif de la cité et les rites individuels montre le soin mis à rappeler les préséances: la collectivité prend le pas sur les individus et, ceux-ci, en l'absence de rites collectifs doivent se soumettre à des prescriptions dont on aimerait connaître le détail. Ne subsistent dans le texte conservé que le préalable de l'incubation, le constat que le sacrifice s'adresse à Asclépios et à Apollon ensemble, mais nommés dans l'ordre du rituel, pas dans celui des préséances de prestige. Il doit falloir comprendre, dans le contexte, que la prière est une alternative à l'incubation (ἢ ἐοξάμενοι) et ne se confond pas avec l'hymne: on peut supposer que le dévot y formule sa demande personnelle. Si l'hypothèse est acceptée, les gestes du rite accompagnent, amplifient et renforcent l'invocation. L'anacoluthe entre le pluriel et le singulier (ἐοξάμενοι θυσίην ἀποδιδῶσιν/ ὅταν τὴν ἱρὴν μοῖραν ἐπιθῇ…) montre que les gestes individuels ne se font pas dans l'isolement mais à l'intérieur d'un groupe. Les singuliers (ἀποδιδῶσιν … ἐπιθῇ) donnent à penser que les gestes sur l'autel (μοίρας ἐπίθεσις) sont dévolus, au nom de chaque dévot, à un officiant unique. Dans son ensemble, le rite comprend quatre éléments: (1) une mise en condition (incubation ou prière préalable), (2) le don d'une offrande

[66] EDELSTEIN/EDELSTEIN 1945, 295, interrompent ici leur transcription.

sacrificielle (θυσίην ἀποδιδῶσιν) avec dépôt d’une part consacrée (μοῖραν ἐπιθῇ), ce qui laisse supposer qu’une partie de l’offrande est prélevée (peut-être pour l’officiant ou pour les sacrifiants), (3) le chant d’un péan, accompagné d’un mouvement de danse autour de l’autel (παιωνίζειν πρῶτον περὶ τὸμ βωμὸν); le πρῶτον donne à penser que le rite ne s’arrête pas là et doit comporter, ultérieurement, d’autres paroles, d’autres gestes, peut-être d’autres offrandes. Dans cette partie du rite, le sens des paroles importe moins que la mise en condition (je n’oserai dire en transe).

La suite du texte, sur la même pierre, est, comme le début, très mutilée. On n’en peut traduire que des *membra disjecta:*

…	…
].	].
]ης	]ês
[ ]	[ ]
] Χοροὶ ἰὴ [	] des chœurs, iê [
] μάκαιρα [	] bienheureuse [
[Πα]ιὰν Ἀπόλλω[ν]	Païan Apollon
[χ]ρυσηλάκα[το	au carquois d’or (ou à la quenouille d’or)
]ᾶι Θεᾶι, ἰὴ ἰὴ [	]âi Déesse, iê, iê, [
]ος εὐκάρπου τε [	]os et de la fertile […
]οι δέ σε Ὧραι τε [	]oi et toi et les Heures aussi [
] αὐτίκα χερ[σὶν	] aussitôt de leurs mains
] ἰὴ ἰὴ Παιὼν	] iê iê Païôn
ἀνέ]τειλας Ἄπολ[λον	tu as fait se lever (ou tu t’es levé) Apollon
Δ]ελφοῖς	pour Delphes
ἰὲ Παιάν.	ié Païan.
…	…

Plusieurs chœurs (Χοροί) chantent des paroles ou une divinité bienheureuse, sans doute Artémis, l’archère ou la fileuse[68] (μάκαιρα… [χ]ρυσηλάκα[το … Θεᾶι), associée à Apollon Péan ([Πα]ιὰν Ἀπόλλω[ν… ἰὴ ἰὴ Παιὼν … Ἄπολ[λον). Cette association et le verbe de mouvement

[67] LATTE 1913, 65, cité par CADILI 1995, 184, n. 711, a relevé que le verbe implique à la fois le chant et la danse: “παιωνίζειν *in hac inscriptione non solo de cantu, sed de saltatione accipiendum, verbis* περὶ τὸμ βωμὸν *demonstratur*.”

[68] J’hésite personnellement à interpréter métaphoriquement l’épithète χρυσηλάκατος (appliquée le plus souvent à Artémis) pour lui faire signifier, comme on le fait généralement: l’archère “aux flèches d’or”. Le sens littéral, “à la quenouille d’or”, me paraît plus pertinent: Artémis est une jeune fille susceptible de filer comme toute autre, autant qu’elle est chasseresse.

(ἀνέ]τειλας), qu'Apollon se lève lui-même ou fasse se lever ceux qui l'accompagnent, évoquent un cortège divin, mené en direction de Delphes (Δ]ελφοῖς) par les deux Létoïdes, accompagnés au moins des Heures (Ὧραι τε…), dont je ne saurais deviner ce que font les mains, si elles ne portent pas des guirlandes ou d'autres objets rituels ou festifs. Tout cela ne se peut que rester conjectural.

Comparé aux deux précédents hymnes, littérairement plus élaborés, cet hymne mutilé présente l'intérêt de donner une idée plus précise du contexte d'exécution et excite l'imagination, bien qu'il faille se garder des surinterprétations.

Conclusion

Les trois hymnes d'époque hellénistique présentés ici montrent pour l'un la perpétuation d'une pratique de la poésie hymnique, littéraire pourrait-on dire, telle que l'attestent déjà les hymnes homériques et lyriques des temps anciens, pour les deux autres, l'existence d'une hymnique rituelle active, plus fruste, associée à des cultes et à des rites, se diffusant d'un sanctuaire à l'autre dans l'ensemble de la Méditerranée grecque, jusqu'aux temps de l'Empire romain. On ne saurait mesurer l'ampleur et la sincérité de cette pratique, comparée à la finalité ludique des hymnes littéraires. Ses formes trop simples suggèrent une pratique, pour le moins peu inventive, routinière en somme.

Résumé

Les trois hymnes analysés ici: 1. à Éros (d'Antagoras, IIIe siècle avant notre ère). 2. à Asclépios (inscription d'Érythrée du IIIe siècle avant notre ère, diffusé en plusieurs lieu de la Méditerranée); 3. à Apollon (péan érythréen du IVe siècle avant notre ère), illustrent à la fois les thématiques communes, largement diffusées et durables des hymnes païens de l'antiquité grecque (eulogie, acclamations, récit ou allusion mythique, prière), la diversité des usages (cultuels associés à des gestes, des danses, des offrandes ou des dédicaces et des sacrifices), des jeux littéraires dont varient à l'infini les formes poétiques, les tons, les occasions et les finalités (les hymnes homériques bien connus n'ont pas été retenus ici), leur vestiges qui en survivent dans les recueils de textes et sur les supports épigraphiques, atteste leur importance, leur succès et leur variété.

Bibliographie

ALLEN, T. W./SIKES, E. E.: The Homeric Hymns. Edited, with preface, apparatus criticus, notes and appendices, London 1904.
– and HALLIDAY, W. R./SIKES, E. E.: The Homeric Hymns, Oxford 1936.
ARDIZZONI, A.: Antagora fr. I, 1 Powell; Callimaco Hymn. I, 5; V, 303. In: Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella, Catania 1972, 415–418.
ASPER, M.: Kallimachos. Werke, Darmstadt 2004.
AUBRETON, R./BUFFIÈRE, F. (ed.): Anthologie planudéenne (Anthologique grecque XVI), Paris 1980.
BADER, F.: Le liage, la peausserie et les poètes-chanteurs Homère et Hésiode. La racine *seh2-'lier'. In: BSL 85 (1990), 1–59.
BAILLET, J.: La stèle de Menschieh. In: Revue d'Archéologique 14 (1889), 70–83.
BASCHERA, C.: Gli scolii veronesi a Virgilio, Verona 1999.
BERNABÉ, A.: Poeta Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta II, 2 vols., München 2004–2005.
– Poeta Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta II 2, München 2005.
BOLLACK, J.: Parménide, de l'étant au monde, Lagrasse 2006.
BONA, G.: Pindaro. I Peani. Testo, traduzione, scoli e commento, Cuneo 1988.
BOSANQUET, R. C./MURRAY, G.: The Palaikastro Hymn of the Kouretes. In: The Annual of the British School at Athens 15 (1908–1909), 339–365.
BREMER, J. M.: Greek Hymns. In: Faith, Hope and Worship, ed. H. S. VERSNEL, Leiden 1981, 193–215.
– Menander Rhetor on Hymns. In: Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle. Papers in Honour of D. M. Schekeveld, Amsterdam 1995, 259–275.
BÜLOW, P.: Ein vielgesungener Asklepiopaian. In: Xenia Bonnensia. Festschrift zum fünfundsiebzigjährigen Bestehen des Philologischen Vereins und Bonner Kreises, ed. H. OPPERMANN, Bonn 1929, 35–47.
BURKERT, W./STOLZ, F. (ed.): Hymnen der alten Welt im Kulturvergleich (OBO 131), Göttingen 1994.
CADILI, L.: Ricerche sul l'innografia ellenistica, Milano 1995 (manuscript).
CAHEN, É.: Les Hymnes de Callimaque. Commentaire explicative et critique, Paris 1930.
CAMPBELL, D. A.: Greek Lyric III (LCL 476), Cambridge 1991.
CASSIO, A. C./CERRI, G. (ed.): L'inno tra ritual e litteratura nei mondo antico. Atti di un colloquio, Napoli et al. 1991.
CÀSSOLA, F.: Inni Omerici, Milano ²1983.
CHANTRAINE, P.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots, Paris 1968–1980; 2° édition augmentée d'un supplément, 2009.
COUGNY, E. (ed.), Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et Appendice Nova. Epigrammatum veterum ex Libris et Marmoribus, Paris 1890.
D'ANGOUR, A.: How the dithyramb got its shape. In: CQ 47 (1997), 331–351.
DE STEFANI, E. L.: Etymologicum Gudianum quod vocatur, 2 vols., Leipzig 1920.
DEVLIN, N. G.: The Hymn in Greek Literature. Studies in Form and Context, Oxford 1994 (manuscript).
DIELS, H./KRANZ, W.: Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und Deutsch, 3 vols., Dublin ⁶1951.
DINDORF, L./BEKKER, I./VOGEL, F./FISCHER, T. (ed.): Diodori Siculi Bibliotheca historicae quae supersunt. Graece et Latine, 5 vols. (BiTeu), Paris 1888–1906.

DORANDI, T.: Crantor. In: Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques, ed. R. GOULET, Paris 1994, II, 482–483.
– Crantor. In: Diogènbe Laerce. Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres, ed. M.-O. GOULET-CAZÉ, Paris 1999, IV, 24–27.
DORIVAL, G./PRALON, D. (ed.): Prières en Méditerrannée. Actes du colloque d'Aix sur la prière (avril 1998), Aix-en-Provence 2000.
DUMÉZIL, G.: Les dieux souverains des Indo-Européens, Paris 1977.
EDELSTEIN, E. J. L./EDELSTEIN, L.: Asclepius. A collection and interpretation of the testimonies, Baltimore 1945.
ERBSE, H. (ed.): Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem, 5 vols., Berlin 1969–1987.
FORD, A.: The Origins of Criticism, Princeton 2002.
FOWLER, R. L.: Early Greek Mythography I, Oxford 2000.
FRASER, P. M.: Ptolemaic Alexandria II, Oxford 1972.
FREYBURGER, G./PERNOT, L.: Bibliographie analytique de la prière grecque et romaine (1898–1998), Turnhout 2000.
FURLEY, W. D.: Types of Greek Hymns 1. In: Eos 81 (1993), 21–41.
– and BREMER, M.: Greek Hymns. Selected Cult Congs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period, 2 vols. (STAC 9–10), Tübingen 2001.
GAISFORD, T. (ed.): Etymologicon magnum. Seu verius lexicon saepissime vocabulorum origines indagans ex pluribus lexicis scholiastis et grammaticis anonymi cuiusdam opera concinnatum, Oxford 1848.
GARVIE, F.: Odyssey. Books VI–VIII, Cambridge 1994.
GIGANTE, M.: Poesia e critica letteraria nell'Accademia Antica, Torino 1963.
HEITSCH, E.: Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit, Göttingen 1963.
HUTCHINSON, G. O.: Hellenistic Poetry, Oxford 1988.
JACOBITZ, K.: Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache, 4 vols., Leipzig 1839.
JACOBS, C. F. W.: Anthologia Carminum Graecorum, München 1820.
– Animadversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae secundum ordinem analectorium Brunckii, 3 vols., Leipzig 1798.
KÄPPEL, L.: Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung (UALG 37), Berlin 1922.
– Paian. In: DNP 9 (2000), 147–149.
KEYSSNER, K.: Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft 2), Stuttgart 1932.
LANG, C.: Cornuti theologiae Graecae compendium (BiTeu), Leipzig 1881.
LASSERRE, F.: La figure d'Éros dans la poésie grecque, Lausanne 1946.
– and LIVARDAS, N. (ed.): Etymologicum magnum genuinum. Symeonis etymologicum una cum magna grammatica. Etymologicum magnum auctum (ἀάλιον—ζειαί), 2 vols., Rome/Athens 1976–1992.
LATTE, K.: De Saltationibus Graecorum Capita Quinque, Gießen 1913.
LATTKE, M.: Hymnus. Materialien zu einer Geschichte der antiken Hymnologie (NTOA 19), Fribourg 1991.
LIBERMANN, G.: Alcée. Fragments, Paris 1999.
LIGHTFOOT, J. L.: Parthenius of Nicaea. The Poetical Fragments and the Erotika Pathemata, Oxford 1999.
LIVREA, E.: Teeteto, Antagora e Callimaco. In: Studi italiani di filologia classica 7 (1989), 24–31.
LLOYD-JONES, H./PARSONS, P.: Supplementum Hellenisticum, Berlin 1983.
LLOYD-JONES, H./SKEMPIS, M.: Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici, Berlin 2005.
LOBEL, E./PAGE, D.: Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta, Oxford 1955.

MACLEOD, M. D.: Soloecista. Lucius or The Ass. Amores. Halcyon. Demosthenes. Podagra. Ocypus. Cyniscus. Philopatris. Charidemus. Nero (LCL 432), Harvard 1967.
– Luciani opera. Vol. 3: Libelli 44–68 (OCT), Oxford 1980.
MAEHLER, H.: Pindarus. Fragmenta (BiTeu), Leipzig 1989.
MARCOVICH, M.: Diogenes Laertius. Vitae Philosophorum (BiTeu), Stuttgart 1999.
MARKWALD, G.: ὕμνος. In: Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. Vol. 4: R–Omega, ed. B. SNELL, Göttingen 2010, 728–729.
MEIBOM, M.: Diogenis Laertii De Vitis, Dogmatibus et Apophthegmatis Clarorum Philosophorum Libri X Graece et Latine, Amstedolami 1692.
MEYER, H.: Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung, Würzburg 1933.
MINEUR, W. H.: Calimachus. Hymn to Delos, Leiden 1984.
MÜLLER, K.: Diodori Siculi Biblioteca historicae quae supersunt. Graece et Latine, 5 vols., Paris 1842.
NAGY, G.: Homer the Classic (Hellenic Studies 36), Cambridge 2009.
OIKONOMOS, G. P.: Ἐπιγραφαὶ τῆς Μακεδονίας, Athens 1915.
PAGE, D. L.: Poetae melici Graeci, Oxford 1962.
PAPE, W./BENSELER, G. E.: Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen, Braunschweig 1870.
PAVESE, C. O.: Il piu antico frammento di lirica corale greca. In: Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a Francesco Della Corte, ed. S. BOLDRINI, Urbino 1987, I, 53–57.
PFEIFFER, R.: Callimachus. II: Hymni et Epigrammata, Oxford 1953.
PORDOMINGO PARDO, F.: Il pean de Macedonico a Apollo y a Asclepio. Un Nuevo hallazgo epigrafico. In: Corolla Londiniensis 4 (1984), 101–129.
POWELL, J. U.: Collectanea Alexandrina, Oxford 1925.
PULLEYN, S.: Prayer in Greek Religion, Oxford 1997.
PUSCH, H.: Quaestiones Zenodoteae. Dissertationes Halenses XI, Halle 1890.
QUANDT, W.: Oprhei Hymni, Berlin 1962.
RENEHAN, R.: The Collectanea Alexandrina. Selected Passages. In. HSCP 68 (1964), 375–388.
RICCIARDELLI, G.: Inni orfici (Scrittori greci e latini), Milano 2000.
RUTHERFORD, I.: Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre, Oxford 2001.
SCHRÖDER, S.: Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian. Eine kritische Untersuchung mit einem Ausblick auf Behandlung und Auffassung der lyrischen Gattungen bei den alexandrinischen Philologen (BzA 121), Stuttgart 1999.
SEVERYNS, A.: Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos. I: Le codex 239 de Photius. T. I: Étude Paléographique et Critique, Liège 1938.
– Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos. I: Le codex 239 de Photius. T. II: Texte, Traduction, Commentaire, Liège 1939.
STRAUSS CLAY, J.: The Homeric Hymns. In: The New Companion to Homer, ed. I. MORRIS et al., Leyden 1997, 489–507.
STURZ, F. W. (ed.): Etymologicum Graece linguae Gudianum. et alia grammaticorum scripta e codicibus manuscriptis nun primum edita, Leipzig 1818.
– (ed.): Orionis Thebani etymologico, Leipzig 1820.
SVARLIEN, D. A.: Callimachus and the Path of Song. "Oimon" for "oiton" at Lav. Pall. 94. In: Hermes 119 (1991), 473–477.
THRAEMER, E.: Panakeia. In: ALGM 3,1 (1902), 1482–1491.
USENER, H.: Götternamen, Bonn 1895.

VAN DEN BERG, R. M.: Proclus' Hymns. Essay, translations, commentary (PhAnt 90), Leiden 2001.
VERSNEL, H. S./VAN STRATEN, F. T. (ed.): Faith, Hope and Worship, Leiden 1981.
VEYNE, P.: Les Grecs ont-ils cru à leurs mythes?, Paris 1983.
VOGEL, F./Fischer, K. T.: Diodori Siculi historicae quae supersunt (BiTeu), 5 vols., Leipzig [3]1888–1906.
VOGT, E.: Procli hymni, Wiesbaden 1957.
VOIGT, E.-M.: Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta, Amsterdam 1971.
VON ARNIM, H: Krantor, in: PRE 11,2 (1922), 1586.
VON DER MÜHLL, P.: Zu den Gedichten des Antagoras von Rhodos. In: MH 19 (1962), 28–32.
VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U.: Antigonos von Karystos (Philologische Untersuchungen 4), Berlin 1881.
– Nordionische Steine (APAW.PH 2), Berlin 1909.
– Der Glaube der Hellenen, 2 vols., Berlin 1931.
WALTZ, P. (ed.): Anthologie grecque I, Paris 1928.
WEHRLI, F.: Eudemos von Rhodos (Die Schule des Aristoteles 8), Basel [2]1969.
WEST, M. L.: The Orphic Poems, Oxford 1983.
WESTERINK, L. G./COMBÈS, J. (ed.): Damascius. Traité des premiers principes, 3 vols., Paris 1986–1991.
WESTPHAL, R.: Scriptores Metrici Graeci, vol I: Hephaestionis de Metris Enchiridion et de Poemate Libellus cum Scholiis et Trichae Epitomis, Adjecta Procli Chrestomathia, Leipzig 1866.
WÜNSCH, R. (ed.): Joannis Lydi. Liber de Mensibus, Leipzig 1898.
– Hymnos. In: PRE 9,1 (1914), 140–183.
ZIMMERMANN, B.: Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung (Hyp. 98), Göttingen 1992.
ZUNTZ, G.: Griechische philosophische Hymnen (STAC 35), ed. H. CANCIK et al., Tübingen 2005.

What can we know about the Beginnings of Christian Hymnody?

HERMUT LÖHR

1. Introduction

The *status quaestionis* of research into the beginnings of Christian hymnody is characterized by two somewhat disparate tendencies:

a. During the last several decades, scholarship has taken a fresh interest in the ritual practice of early Christianity. Aspects such as localities, times or the order of the Christian service, common and individual prayer or meal practices have been scrutinized anew. This research has produced considerable new insights not only into the rites, but also into the implicit religious convictions of the first Christians. With regard to the tradition history, we have especially learned from Jewish sources (e.g. from the various texts found near Chirbet Qumran[1]). A vast majority of scholars of early Christianity is now inclined to see the beginnings of Christian service deeply rooted in Second Temple Judaism. This situation differs markedly from that of the first half of the 20th century, a period in which, under the influence of the so-called *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, pagan religion, and the Mediterranean mystery cults foremost, seemed to provide the best analogies to and probably the source of early Christian ritual, especially baptism and eucharist.

b. On the other hand, awareness of the methodological problems in reconstructing Christian ritual practice has grown considerably during the last few decades.

Scholars connected with classical *Formgeschichte*, such as Rudolf BULTMANN or Martin DIBELIUS, were convinced they were able to distinguish neatly between (oral) "tradition" and (literary) "redaction" within a written text. And, what is more, they were ready to locate

---

[1] In this volume, s. the article by Daniel FALK, 33–87.

considerable parts of the assumed oral tradition within the context of early Christian worship.

However, new reflections on the presuppositions of such an approach have led to a more circumspect position: Nowadays, it is wideley accepted that a precise reconstruction of oral traditions from a written text is hardly possible, especially when longer passages are in view. In addition, it should be stressed that the equation of liturgy and orality is evidently erroneous and thus should not be applied to earliest Christianity. Written texts can be liturgical in character as well (we have rich examples for this in the Qumran literature), and every single case has to be analyzed on its own.

This is not to deny any connection between the different spheres, but any claim that a literary text derives from the practice of the early communities has to be argued for carefully. This is especially true for the quest for early Christian hymns which were supposed to have been sung in Christian communal services and from there to have entered into the texts. Whereas, Philipp VIELHAUER's now classical "Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur"[2] summarized the research of his time in counting a considerable variety of texts[3] as early Christian songs, Klaus BERGER, a prominent representative of the new form criticism in German scholarship, lists only Acts 4:24b-30 and part of the Lord's Prayer among the category of hymn. He states additionally:

> Andere neutestamentliche Texte, die üblicherweise als Hymnen bezeichnet werden, verdienen diese formgeschichtliche Bezeichnung nicht.[4]

In an exemplary way, Gordon FEE[5] and Ralph BRUCKER[6] tried to demonstrate that the so-called Christ hymn in Phil 2 is not a (pre-literary) hymn, but an example of "exalted prose" composed by Paul[7].

Even Martin HENGEL in his more conservative overview of early Christian hymnody[8], which may still be representative for a majority position in

---

[2] Cf. VIELHAUER 1975, 40–47. Vielhauer is relying on WENGST 1972.

[3] Luke 1:46–55,68–79; Phil 2:6–11; Col 1:15–20; 1Tim 3:16; 1Pet 2:21–14; 3:18–22; Hebr 1:1–3, Ign. Eph. 19.2f. or 1Pet 2:21–24. Even more optimistic was SCHILLE 1965.

[4] BERGER 2005, 298.

[5] Cf. FEE 1992.

[6] Cf. BRUCKER 1997, also in this volume, 1–15.

[7] KENNEL 1995 does not apply the genre categories from (pagan) antiquity and labels the passage a "durchgeformter christologischer Bekenntnistext" (276).

[8] Cf. HENGEL 2006. Originally published in 1987, no reference to Berger, Fee, or Brucker, is added in the 2006 version of the article.

scholarship on the beginnings of Christianity, adduces texts like Rom 11:33-36; Eph 5:14; 1Tim 3:16 and Phil 2:6-11 as possible candidates, but he is at the same time eager to stress the hypothetical character of such a postulate. In short, as is the case with other "minor forms" in early Christian literature like "acclamation" or "homology", scholarship is presently somewhat divided about the extent of the form critical approach in general and so also about the existence, the function and the characteristics of early Christian hymns.

2. Methodology I: Literature and Oral Tradition

Recent research and methodological discussion and reflections have lead to the following insights which, in my eyes, should be taken into account:

a. Any quest for the traces of early Christian liturgy has to start from the description of the Christian ritual in the sources themselves. It seems to be widely accepted that, for example, BULTMANN's and DIBELIUS' (different) approaches to interpreting the synoptic tradition within the frame of early Christian worship were incomplete in neglecting the evidence from our sources,[9] scattered as it may be. So, it would be in vain to look for early Christian hymns if our sources did not say anything about hymnody in the first decades of Christianity. Quite to the contrary, this is the first step to take.

b. It is a precarious task to identify Christian ritual in the literary remnants of the time. The criteria of separating "redaction" from "tradition" are, contrary to the convictions of the older *Formgeschichte*, far from undisputed. William Hulitt GLOER conveniently listed some sixteen criteria which were proposed in preceding scholarship to identify homologies and hymns in literary texts.[10] GLOER himself signals the vagueness of some of the criteria. I have not the space to discuss those criteria in detail here, but a majority of them, I think, does not allow for a

[9] S. the introdoctury remarks in DIBELIUS 1971, 8–34, and BULTMANN 1970, 1–8.

[10] GLOER 1984, 124–129. Gloer mentions: (1) Presence of a quotation particle, (2) use of the double infinitive and the accusative to express indirect discourse, (3) presence of certain introductory formulae, (4) syntactical disturbance, (5) stylistic differences, (6) linguistic differences, (7) content, (8), parallelism, (9) rhythm, (10) chiasmus, (11) antithesis, (12) participial style, (13) relative style, (14) arrangement in strophes, verses or stanzas, (15) highly stylized construction and (16) the presence of different passages which contain the same basic form.

clear distinction between redactional and traditional elements within a given text, and it is not clear at all whether one, some, or all of them, should be applied in order to identify hymns and homologies. The history of research with its varying attributions of the label "hymn" to this or that early Christian text shows sufficiently that the methodological ground is shaky.[11]

In this regard I would opt for a rather strict approach. In those cases where explicit quotations, formulae or external evidence for cultic usage are lacking, we should look for clear indications on the semantic and the syntactical level for a text to be isolated from its context. To cite one prominent example from the history of research in form criticism and liturgical studies: There are certainly parallels between 1Cor 16:22 and Didache 10:6, which could suggest a liturgical origin of the phrases used by Paul. But, as Klaus THRAEDE has demonstrated convincingly,[12] the letter ending of 1Cor forms a perfectly plausible primary context for the verse in question,[13] and so it is not compelling to understand this letter ending as a part of Christian liturgy.

In many cases it is much more plausible to think not in terms of direct reception and insertion of traditional pieces (a philological paradigm dating back to the 19th century), but in terms of allusion and eclectic usage of this or that phrase or composition. The German expression *nachahmende Gattungen* (imitating genres) coined by Hubert FRANKEMÖLLE[14] may not be the most elegant one, but it points in the right direction. To put it in another way: The connection between literature and liturgy in early Christianity, though surely not totally lacking, might very well be less direct than elder form criticism and literary critique suggested.

c. Any reconstruction of early Christian tradition, literary or oral, has to take into account the notion of genres which is reflected in the terminology of the sources themselves. It was one of the major flaws of classical form criticism (with the noticeable exception of Paul FIEBIG who introduced

---

[11] This insight is not new; it was already brought forward at a time when New Testament "*Formkritik*" just began to flourish, s. KROLL 1968 (originally published 1921/1922) , 12f. note 1.

[12] Cf. THRAEDE 1968/69, 136–143.

[13] And it is far from being sure that Did 10:6 was followed by the celebration of the eucharist proper, as Hans LIETZMANN (LIETZMANN 1926, 236) suggested. For a convincing solution s. KOCH 2008, esp. 205–207. KLINGHARDT 1996, 380 interprets Did 10:6 with regard to later liturgical texts in terms of liturgical rubrics ("rubrikale Regelung").

[14] FRANKEMÖLLE 1979. The terminology was accepted by BERGER 2005, 64, 78f.

rabbinic designations into New Testament scholarship[15]) to neglect this aspect. So one of the questions to ask with regard to early Christian hymnody is: Which designations are used in the texts themselves? Do they allow for exact distinctions in the field of religious poetry? It might very well be that the terminology of the sources cannot describe the textual phenomena sufficiently, but nevertheless the evidence should not be neglected.

d. A majority of scholars would agree today that early Christianity is deeply rooted in Second Temple Judaism. What is true of terms and concepts, cannot be totally false with regard to religious practice. So if we look for the roots of Christian hymnody, for its function and forms, the first field of reference should be that of contemporaneous Judaism, which itself had already undergone massive pagan-hellenistic influence by the time Christianity emerged.

3. Methodology II: What is a Hymn?

It is not completely clear what we mean when we speak of early Christian hymns. Philipp VIELHAUER, for example, in his work mentioned above[16], avoided the terminus "hymn" altogether because of its divergent connotations in Old Testament, Judaic and Classic Studies. He simply spoke of "Lieder" (songs). Martin HENGEL prefers to speak of psalms or Christ psalms (but also repeatedly of "Christuslied"), because of formal parallels in Jewish poetry, but also with regard to the terminology used in Col 3:16/Eph 5:18-20.[17] Whereas classical form criticism within Biblical scholarship had some difficulties in telling the difference between hymns and prayers or homologies, in recent contributions categories from

[15] Cf. FIEBIG 1925. As a professor in Leizpig, Fiebig (1876–1949) later co-operated with the anti-semite "Institut zur Erforschung (und Beseitigung) des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben" in Eisenach. This aspect of his life and work is not even mentioned explicitly in the online *catalogus professorum lipsiensium* (catalogue of professors of the University of Leipzig (http://www.uni-leipzig.de/unigeschichte/professorenkatalog/leipzig/Fiebig_406/markiere:Fiebig/ [searched Aug., 20th, 2013]) or in the article on Fiebig by RÜGER 1961, The Leipzig catalogue, however, does give the link to: http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Fiebig (searched Aug., 20th, 2013).

[16] S. note 2.

[17] Cf. HENGEL 2006, 236, and *passim*.

rhetorical criticism such as ἐγκώμιον[18], ἔπαινος, or epideictic prose[19] provide refinements or alternatives to the category of hymn.

But the terminological difficulties extend far beyond the realm of biblical studies. As a recent contribution to the discussions demonstrates, William FURLEY's and Jan BREMER's introduction to their collection of Greek hymns,[20] modern scholarship on Greek and Roman religion is not much clearer at this point than Biblical studies, and this is partly due to the fact that the texts from antiquity themselves have different understandings of the category. Plato, for example, made a dinstiction between ὕμνοι as songs in praise of gods, and ἐγκώμια for men (Resp. 10.607a [ed. SHOREY 1935, 464]). A definition from the second century B.C.E. by the grammarian Dionysios Thrax, however, understands hymn as a poem comprising praises of gods and heroes together with thanksgiving.[21] Plato's definition quoted above is also accepted into the only extant comprehensive discussion of hymns in the context of the γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν in the rhetorical handbooks, in Menander Rhetor's first treatise (ca. 300 C.E.)[22]. Other examples from different times and authors could be adduced, and it should also be said that Plato's definition just quoted is not the only one to be found in his work[23].

What becomes clear from this discussion is that "hymn" is an umbrella term which covers a variety of texts and sub-genres. This is not only true for modern scholarship, but also for ancient rhetorical theory and literary and other practice itself. In addition, it should be stressed that the category does not decide on the question of original orality or literacy. We do find some reflections on hymns in the rhetorical handbooks other than Menander's in which they are part of the γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν.[24] And, it should also be mentioned that the category "hymn" may be used for poetry, but also for (exalted) prose (the most prominent, but by far not the

[18] For a short critique of Klaus BERGER's use of this category (BERGER 2005, 401–403, s. also BERGER 1984, 1171–1194) in the light of ancient rhetoric, s. VOLLENWEIDER 2010, 212f.

[19] This is the category preferred by BRUCKER 1997, in this volume, 1–15.

[20] Cf. FURLEY/BREMER 2001; PULLEYN 1997, 43–55; s. also GORDLEY 2007, 30–39, 124–133; THRAEDE 1994. Rich material from different times and cultures in antiquity is provided by LATTKE 1991.

[21] Cf. FURLEY/BREMER 2001, I, 9.

[22] Menander (ed. SPENGEL 1856) 333–344 distinguishes no less than eight types of hymns.

[23] Cf. PULLEYN 1997, 44–46.

[24] For this, cf. the helpful article by KRENTZ 1995, s. also VOLLENWEIDER 2010.

only or the earliest example of prose hymns being that of Aelius Aristides from the 2nd century C.E.).[25]

In investigating early Christian hymnody (that is: hymn singing, to be distinguished from hymnography and hymnology), we focus on performance and practice in contrast to literary production alone. What should be clear now is that identifying a text segment as a "hymn" cannot determine its prehistory or its original function. In other words: The genre of hymns and the phenomenon of hymnody are only partly overlapping in antiquity, be it pagan, Jewish, or Christian.

4. Early Christian Terminology

In the parenetic context Col 3:5–4:6, the admonition in 3:16 combines three words which all express a kind of religious poetry. This verse is repeatedly interpreted as an instruction for the communal worship, but the reference to worship could also serve to give a model for the every day life of the addressees. It says:

Ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικείτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτούς, ψαλμοῖς ὕμνοις ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς ἐν [τῇ] χάριτι ᾄδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν τῷ θεῷ·

Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; teach and admonish one another in all wisdom; and with gratitude in your hearts sing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs to God. (NRSV)

The participial constructions in v. 16b develop the introductory exhorttation. The combination of "to teach" and "to admonish" with "in all wisdom" refers back to 1:28, the description of the apostolic mission. This function is transferred here to the community. The syntactical structure of the verse is somewhat ambiguous: Is the series of nouns ψαλμοῖς ὕμνοις ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς[26] linked to the preceding two participles, or to the following one (ᾄδοντες)? The understanding mentioned first would probably be the more obvious one from a syntactical point of view, with the psalms etc. being the means of teaching etc.[27] To link the nouns to

[25] NORDEN 1898, 844 understood Plato, Phaedr. 237a–241e and 244a–245a as early prose hymns on Eros. For Aelius Aristides, s. GORDLEY 2007, 142–147.

[26] One may also ask whether πνευματικαῖς only refers to ᾠδαῖς, or to all three nouns. For the latter view, s. BLASS/DEBRUNNER/REHKOPF 1984, § 135,5.

[27] For this understanding, cf. DEICHGRÄBER 1967, 188; HENGEL 2006, 24, against it SALZMANN 1994, 82 n. 163.

ᾄδοντες would be closer to 1:28[28]; in this case, the phrase would not only develop the preceding one, but at the same time, it would add a new aspect: singing psalms etc. as a further possibility for the word Christ to dwell in the congreation besides teaching and admonition. The phrase ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν does not exclude a reference to communal service, but it might refer to the origin and the motivation for singing songs.

It is not clear whether the three expressions used in this verse, i.e. ψαλμός, ὕμνος, ᾠδη[29], can be understood as three distinct categories of Christian poetry[30].

The verse from Col 3 is taken over, modified and expanded in Eph 5:18–20:

ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι, λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς [ἐν][31] ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ, εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί.

but be filled with the Spirit, as you sing psalms and hymns and spiritual songs among yourselves, singing and making melody to the Lord in your hearts, giving thanks to God the Father at all times and for everything in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. (NRSV)

The phrase quoted begins with the reference to the spirit instead of that to the word of Christ. The syntactical structure appears to be less ambiguous, psalms etc. are the medium of speaking to each other[32]. Reference to private dialogue is not excluded, but not very probable either. It is not far-fetched, I think, to see here an allusion to gatherings of the community and to communal worship. The vers thus does not speak of two different practices, namely speaking and singing. The singing is addressed to the "Lord", in this context: the Lord Jesus Christ. Thanksgiving is mentioned in Col 3 and here. But while in Col 3:15,17, it is repeated in order to summarize the different exhortation, here in Eph 5, εὐχαριστεῖν is probably[33] put on the same level as the songs addressed to Christ. Thus both,

---

[28] Cf. WOLTER, 1993, 180.

[29] All three are *hapax legomena* in Col.

[30] HENGEL 2006, 244 n. 3 refers to the interpretation of the passage by Clement of Alexandria, Paed. 2:4:44:1 (ed. STÄHLIN/TREU 1972, 184). S. KROLL 1968, 4–7 for further discussion and references.

[31] It is doubtful whether the particle is present in the oldest text or whether it was added because of the parallel in Col; cf. [28]NESTLE-ALAND, critical appartus *ad loc.*

[32] Since ἐν πνεύματι is linked to πληροῦσθε, λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς is complemented by the following phrase.

[33] For SCHLIER 1971, 248f., εὐχαριστοῦντες is subordinate to ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες, and the phrase refers to the celebration of the eucharist.

singing psalms, hymns and spiritiual songs, and thanksgiving (in prayer) may have been, for the author, part of the communal worship. Col 3:16 and Eph 5:18–20 are the only New Testament instances for the use of ὕμνος.[34]

The verb ὑμνέω occurs more often in the New Testament,[35] but never with respect to songs sung in the regular Christian service. While Mt 26:30/Mark 14:26, a passage referring to the last supper of Jesus and his followers, might give us a piece of historical information on Jewish ritual practice, it would be premature to conclude from the text that hymnody was part of the early Christian celebration of the eucharist[36].

In conclusion, we cannot say that ὕμνος or the related verb, are *termini technici* for religious songs or poetry in the language of the first Christians. This result may be contrasted with the usage of Philo of Alexandria, for whom ὕμνος is the standard designation for biblical psalms[37].

In early Christian language, the situation is different for the word ψαλμός. From the usage in the passages quoted from Colossians and Ephesians, we cannot tell whether the authors are thinking of biblical or other psalms.

The earliest instance is 1Cor 14:26. In this verse, individual new compositions seem to be in view:

Τί οὖν ἐστιν, ἀδελφοί; ὅταν συνέρχησθε, ἕκαστος ψαλμὸν ἔχει, διδαχὴν ἔχει, ἀποκάλυψιν ἔχει, γλῶσσαν ἔχει, ἑρμηνείαν ἔχει· πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω.

What should be done then, my friends? When you come together, each one has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation. Let all things be done for building up. (NRSV)

In some instances from Luke/Acts[38] the book of biblical psalms – or a part of it – is meant, and ψαλμός thus refers to Holy Scripture, not to prayers pronounced or songs sung. This usage is also to be found in Justin

[34] ὕμνος is used three times in the extant texts of Justin Martyr. While in Dial. 34:6 and in 65:5 it refers to biblical passages (Psalm 72:20; Jes 42:10), in Apol. 13:2 it seems to have Christian songs of praise in view.

[35] Cf. Mt 26:30 par. Mark 14:26; Acts 16:25 (Paul and Silas in custody; for the song of the martyrs s. also Acts Pion. 18 [KNOPF/KRÜGER 1929, 55]); Hebr 2:12.

[36] Cf. HENGEL 2006, 213. For the verb in Justin, s. Dial. 65:5; 98:5, and 106:1f.; it is always used in the context of biblical quotations.

[37] Cf. LEONHARDT 2001, 157. In Josephus, Ant. 6:214; 7.80; 9:35 ψαλμός refers to the instrument, while the plural in Ant. 12:323 could also have a special kind of songs in view.

[38] Cf. Luke 20:42; 24:44; Acts 1:20; 13:33.

Martyr[39]. For this reason the use of ψαλμός in descriptive language to designate songs sung in early Christian communal worship could be somewhat confusing.

As for the verb ψάλλειν, it is contrasted to προσεύχομαι in 1Cor 14:15 and in James 5:13, whereas Eph 5:19 puts it in parallel with ᾄδω. In Rom 15:9 and in Barn 6:16, the same verb occurs within the quotation from Psalm 108:4 (LXX: 107), in parallel with ἐξομολογέομαι. The usage in these different contexts does not permit the defining of ψάλλειν only with regard to communal service.[40]

Apart from its use in Col and Eph, the noun ᾠδή is present in Rev 5:9, 14:3, and 15:3. In 5:9 it is used together with ᾄδειν to introduce the quotation of the "new song" honouring the Lamb, which is sung by the elders in heaven. The allusion to the heavenly song – this time without an explicit quotation – is repeated in 14:3, while in 15:3 the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb are mentioned, and the latter one is quoted.

The verb ᾄδειν can also be found in the letters of Ignatius.[41] While in Ign. Eph. 4:1f. and in Ign. Rom. 2.2 the musical imagery is used to stress the admonition to unity under the bishop, and while this topos and imagery has parallels in the Greco-Roman and Jewish literature from antiquity[42], an allusion to the communal worship may lay behind it. Both passages have in view praise to Jesus Christ and the Father "through Jesus Christ", thus probably referring to the most common form of doxology in early Christianity[43]. At the same time, the phrase διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν καὶ συμφώνῳ ἀγάπῃ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ᾄδεται in Ign. Eph 4:1, while obviously making use of musical imagery for a different purpose, may have in view songs sung in praise of Christ. In Ign. Magn. 1:2 the individual praise of Ignatius is described as ᾄδειν; here a variety of objects of the praise is mentioned, among them the ἐκκλησίαι[44].

Our investigation of some of the terminology used in the sources demonstrates that the early Christians had no fixed terminology to designate singing and songs in their communal service. At the same time,

---

[39] Cf. HENGEL 2006, 234.

[40] For the use in Justin, s. especially Dial. 29:2; 74:3. For semantic developments of the verb, cf. Hengel 2006, 240f.

[41] Cf. Ign. Eph. 4:1,2; Ign. Magn. 1:2; Ign. Rom. 2:2.

[42] Cf. SCHOEDEL 1985, 51–53.

[43] S. below note 59.

[44] SCHOEDEL 1985, 104 draws a parallel to the praise of cities in the prose hymns of Aelius Aristides.

however, it becomes clear that praising God and Christ through singing was within their imagination from the earliest times onward.

5. Hymnodic Practice

We have only little and scattered information about the early Christian service. The first author to describe it in detail is Justin Martyr in his Apology, chapters 65 to 67. Whereas prayers are mentioned repeatedly,[45] the passage makes no mention of hymnody. A somewhat doubtful reference to hymn singing can be found, however, in Apol. 13:2[46].

While our earliest Christian church order, the Didache, does not speak at all of hymn singing, but gives examples of ritual prayers for a communal meal, the somewhat vague and imprecise indications of Pliny the Younger (Ep. 10:96 [ed. MYNORS 1963, 339]) may hint at Christ hymns sung during Christian service. The famous phrase *carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere* is most probably to be understood in the sense of singing hymns,[47] and it was in fact understood so by Tertullian (Apol. 2:6 [ed. DEKKERS 1954, 81]) and Eusebius (Hist. eccl. 3:33:1–3 [ed. SCHWARTZ 1903, 272]), although other interpretations seemed possible.

The short and idealized information about the first Christian community in Jerusalem which Luke gives in his summary in Acts 2, does not mention explicitly hymn singing, though that might be implied in the notion of the meal taken “with jubilation” (ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει) in 2:46.

So, while the deutero-Pauline texts Col 3:16 and Eph 5:19 might refer of songs sung in communal service, they do not explicitly say so. The earliest datable texts are at the same time one of the surest indication that the first Christians included hymnody in their communal service. In 1Cor 14:15–26, in the context of a discussion of different spiritual gifts displayed in the assembly, psalm-singing “in the spirit (τῷ πνεύματι)” is mentioned. With regard to this idea of inspired psalm-singing, but also to the phrase ἕκαστος ψαλμὸν ἔχει in v. 26, it seems most probable to me that

---

[45] Cf. Justin, Apol. 65:1–3; 66:2f.; 67:2f.

[46] ἐκείνῳ δὲ εὐχαρίστους ὄντας διὰ λόγου πομπὰς καὶ ὕμνους πέμπειν (ed. MUNIER 1995, 52).

[47] For the discussion on the meaning of *carmen*, s. LÖHR 2003, 426.

Paul is not thinking here of the recitation of biblical psalms, but of songs newly composed or spontaneously sung.[48]

An additional word should be said about early Christian apocalyptic texts. We already saw that part of the apocalyptic imagination is the heavenly service in which hymns are sung. This motif is not only developed in Revelation,[49] but also in Mart. Ascen. Isa. But while in Revelation the texts of the heavenly hymns are quoted explicitly,[50] this is not so in Mart. Ascen. Isa. Further, there is no clear indication in either text that these scenes are moulded after the communal experience of the early Christians. The motif of correspondence between the heavenly and earthly realms, well-known from Jewish sources of the time[51], is not present, nor that of the community of heavenly and human beings in divine service[52]. In other words, the texts in question tell a lot concerning the imagination of the heavenly realm and its praise of God in early Christian thought, but, to my opinion, nothing substantial of the early earthly liturgy in practice.

A further comment should be made on the rich evidence of Christian hymnody in the New Testament apocrypha, foremost the apocryphal Acts. Although the texts supposedly convey stories from apostolic times, the historical value of the information given seems to be minimal. The enormously rich evidence for Christian hymns and hymnody which can be found in the early Christian Apocrypha, is, to my knowledge, not yet sufficiently analysed. However, this corpus could help to elucidate the history of hymnody in the times of the respective texts and their traditions, though probably not the origins of Christian ritual practice. Let it suffice here to say that the image the Acts give of the communal service does, every now and then, also include hymns.[53]

But, regular service is not of central importance for these texts: The hymn sung by Jesus himself in Acts John 94f., though probably comprising liturgical elements, is not introduced as a hymn performed in regular

---

[48] Direct evidence for the use of the biblical psalms in early Christian communal worship is lacking, for evidence from the 3rd. century C.E. cf. HENGEL 2006, 219.

[49] Cf. Rev 4:8,11; 5:9f.,12:13; 7.10; 11:17f.; 12:10-12; 15:3f..;16:5-7; 19:1-8. For the hymns in Rev 4f., s. TÓTH 2006, 202–211, also for further bibliographical indications.

[50] Cf. also Apoc. Paul 14g (transl. KAPPLER 1997, 795); 18c (transl. KAPPLER 1997, 799); *Liber Resurrectionis Bartholomaei* 13.3–16.7 (transl. KAESTLI 1997, 335–338).

[51] Cf. EGO 1989.

[52] For this s. LÖHR 1991, 202 with notes.

[53] Cf. Acts Paul 9:4 (transl. RORDORF 1997, 1152); cf. also *Liber Ressurrectionis Bartholomaei* 5:1 (transl. KAESTLI 1997, 317).

service. The same is true for the hymns sung by Jude in Acts Thom. 6:2–7:2; 70:2–4; 72:1f. and 108:1–113:105[54].

6. Texts and Structures

We repeatedly mentioned the passage Col 3:16 and its reception in Eph 5:18–20. While the verse in Colossians speaks of songs sung to God (and only in secondary textual tradition[55] of those sung to the Lord, Jesus Christ), Eph 5:19 replaces θεός with κύριος and continues to speak of "our Lord Jesus Christ" in the following verse. For the author of Ephesians, so it seems, religious songs have Jesus Christ as their direct addressee, while "thanksgiving" mentioned in v. 20 is directed to God the Father "in the Name of our Lord, Jesus Christ".

Two verses from the Deutero-Paulines may be insufficient evidence for determining a main feature of early Christian hymnody. But in fact, if we consider the popular candidates for the label "early Christian hymn", most of them are indeed Christ-hymns, while only a few texts which were labelled as hymns have God as their addressee or main character (Rom 11:33–36; 1Tim 6:15b–16[56], Rev 4:8,11; 7:10,12; 15:3f.).

Let us have a closer look at those texts from early Christianity (until ca. 150 C.E.) which are considered to be hymns performed in communal worship[57]. It is not possible to discuss each item separately here. Nevertheless, the following observations can be made:

a. In the respective contexts, no indication is given that the texts were taken over from communal services or that they are or should be performed repeatedly.

b. A syntactical discontinuity with regard to the context can only be noticed, as far as I see, in 1Tim 3:16: The masculine relative pronoun ὅς, which introduces the hymnic passage, has no direct reference in the preceding verse, which has τὸ μυστήριον as its subject. The syntactical phenomenon could be understood as the indication of an insertion of a

---

[54] For the hymns in Acts Thom. s. the article by ROUWHORST in this volume, 195–212.

[55] Cf. [28]NESTLE-ALAND, apparatus *ad loc.*

[56] KROLL 1968, 36f. adds Acts 4:24–30, a text which is addressed to God.

[57] Date and *Sitz im Leben* of the *Odes of Solomon* are much debated. in scholarship. In my view, they are not a direct outcome of early Christian communal worship, but tbey may very well echo the liturgical language of their time and milieu.

poetic text (fragment) into an epistolary context, but one may also speak of a *constructio ad sensum*, which does not provide any conclusive evidence for the history of composition of the text. It should be added that syntactical[58] and stylistic features, as well as the semantic profile, of the verse do not strongly suggest it to be a hymn. One might, e.g., consider "confession" to be a suitable label[59].

c. While some of the hymns identified in scholarship have God as their subject, the majority of these texts consists of Christ-hymns. A comparison to early Christian prayer texts is illuminating: The prayers address God almost exclusively; when doxologies are attached they are said to be mediated by Christ[60]. Since we cannot be sure that the hymnic texts in question were performed (sung) in private or communal worship, is it too far-fetched to conclude that the so-called hymnic passages from early Christian literature are a specific form of Jesus narrative?

d. While the French classicist Jean IRIGOIN tried to establish a rhythmic scheme for the hymns in Luke 1 and 2,[61] and Matthew GORDLEY recently demonstrated that the so-called Colossian Hymn (Col 1:15–20) is composed in rhythmic prose,[62] it appears that meter and rhyme are not the primary building principles of the texts in question. While it might very well be that future research will lead to new insights in this respect, for now it can be said that research has not succeeded in identifying any such thing as standard meters in early Christian hymnography. In later texts, however, meter and rhyme seem to be of greater importance.[63] A closer analysis of the so-called "Psalm of the Naassenes" transmitted by Hippolytos (Haer. 5:10:12)[64] could demonstrate that we also have to reckon with different meters used in one single text. This means that arguments *metri causa* related to judgments concerning literary criticism are somewhat precarious.

e. The texts identified in scholarship as hymns or hymnic passages are comparably short. While it cannot be excluded beforehand that early

---

[58] For VOLLENWEIDER 2010, 227, it is simply unthinkable ("undenkbar") that the passage is a hymn because of the repeated use of the passive voice.

[59] KROLL 1968, 15 uses the designation "Konfession".

[60] For the development of the doxology in Jewish and early Christian tradition, s. LÖHR 2003, 485–501.

[61] Cf. IRIGOIN 1991.

[62] Cf. GORDLEY 2007, 181–190.

[63] Cf., e.g., the long hymns contained in Acts John and Acts Thom., or the fragment of a song in a manuscript of Melito's On Pascha, cf. HENGEL 2006, 233f.

[64] Text: WOLBERGS 1971, 6f.

Christian hymns are preserved and handed down only in fragments, texts like Phil 2:6–11 or Col 1:15–20 appear to be structurally and semantically coherent and complete. While it is uncertain whether these two texts were ever performed as hymns, in general one cannot rule out the possibility that hymnodic practice in early Christianity (as in later times) implies the repetition of some of the text lines. But direct evidence for this is missing.

f. Structural analysis of our texts was successful in finding stylistic features such as different kinds of parallelism, inclusion, chiasm or climax, and in explaining their importance for the cohesion of the texts. While those features do also appear in pagan hymns, one gets the impression that the closest parallels can be found in the Jewish tradition. An analysis of the terms and motifs used in the texts points to the same source. This suggests that early Christian poetry was primarily influenced by Judaism and that its poets were originally singers or readers of Jewish songs.

g. It is not possible to describe a common structure of early Christian hymns. The tripartite structure of acclamation, praise, and prayer mentioned by FURLEY/BREMER and GORDLEY, fails to convince. The motifs of creation and redemption, which, according to Gordley, were of utmost importance for Second Temple Jewish hymnography, are extant in some of our texts; their commonality, however, do not qualify them as tools for a more detailed structural analysis of early Christian texts. It appears that structural variety is one of the characteristics of hymnic texts in early Christianity. This may parallel developments in Jewish literature of the era, which, according to GORDLEY, shows features of "incredible diversity in a very popular genre"[65].

Results

The overview of the *status quaestionis* in research on early Christian hymnody proposed here may be summarized as follows:

a. Reflection on the method as well as our knowledge of the different definitions and classifications of "hymns" proposed in antiquity suggest the need to differentiate between hymnography as a phenomenon of literary production and hymnody as a religious practice in early Christianity. Neglect of this difference has marred the approach of biblical form criticism to hymns considerably and lastingly.

[65] GORDLEY 2007, 110.

b. There is weak but sufficient evidence for hymn singing in early Christian communal service from the beginning. It is, however, difficult to tell whether the first Christians made use of fixed (and written) hymns for communal singing, or whether they preferred individual or *ad hoc* compositions for solo performance.

c. We cannot tell with any certainty whether the passages identified within early Christian texts as hymns by scholarship were in fact used as hymns in Christian worship. Methodological considerations suggest the authors of these literary texts imitated and adapted the style and structure of hymns.

d. Passages identified as hymns have God or Christ, later on also the Spirit, the Law, the Soul etc. as their main subject. The number and importance of the so-called Christ hymns in early Christianity is remarkable.

e. The texts in questions have their closest parallels in Jewish literature and the poetry of the Second Temple period, with regard to vocabulary, motifs, structure, and style. It is not possible, however, to identify a fixed hymnic scheme applied regularly in early Judaism or the beginnings of Christianity.

Bibliography

BERGER, K.: Formen und Gattungen im Neuen Testament, Tübingen/Basel 2005.

BERGER, K.: Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament. In: ANRW II 25/4, Berlin/New York 1984, 1031–1432, 1831–1885.

BLASS, F./DEBRUNNER, A./REHKOPF, F.: Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, Göttingen, [16]1984.

BRUCKER, R.: ‘Christushymnen’ oder ‘epideiktische Passagen’? Studien zum Stilwechsel im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt (FRLANT 176), Göttingen 1997.

BULTMANN, R.: Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (FRLANT 29), Göttingen, [8]1970.

DEICHGRÄBER, R.: Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit. Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen (StUNT 5), Göttingen 1967.

DEKKERS, E. (ed.): Q. S. Fl. Tertulliani Apologeticum. In: id. (ed.), Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera. Pars I: Opera catholica. Adversus Marcionem (CCL 1), Turnhout 1954, 77–171.

DIBELIUS, M.: Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, Tübingen [6]1971.

EGO, B.: Im Himmel wie auf Erden. Studien zum Verhältnis von himmlischer und irdischer Welt im rabbinischen Judentum (WUNT II/34), Tübingen 1989.

FEE, G. D.: Philippians 2:5-11: Hymn or Exalted Pauline Prose? In: BBR 22 (1992), 29–46.

FIEBIG, P.: Der Erzählungsstil der Evangelien. Im Lichte des rabbinischen Erzählungsstils untersucht, zugleich ein Beitrag zum Streit um die “Christusmythe” (UNT 11), Leizpig 1925.

FRANKEMÖLLE, H.: Evangelist und Gemeinde. Eine methodenkritische Besinnung (mit Beispielen aus dem Matthäusevangelium). In: Bib. 60 (1979), 153–190.
FURLEY, W. D./BREMER, J. M.: Greek Hymns, 2 vols. (STAC 9/10), Tübingen 2001.
GLOER, W. H.: Homologies and Hymns in the New Testament: Form, Content and Criteria for Identification. In: PRS 11 (1984), 115–132.
GORDLEY, M. E.: The Colossian Hymn in Context. An Exegesis in Light of Jewish and Greco-Roman Hymnic and Epistolary Conventions (WUNT II/228), Tübingen 2007.
HENGEL, M.: Das Christuslied im frühesten Gottesdienst. In: id., Studien zur Christologie. Kleine Schriften IV. Ed. C.-J. THORNTON (WUNT 201), Tübingen 2006, 205–258.
INSTITUT FÜR NEUTESTAMENTLICHE TEXTFORSCHUNG (ed.): Novum Testamentum Graece, Stuttgart [28]2012.
IRIGOIN, J.: La composition rythmique des cantiques de Luc. In: RB 98 (1991), 5–50.
KAESTLI, J.-D. et al.: Livre de la résurrection de Jésus-Christ par l'apôtre Barthélemy. In: Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I, ed. F. BOVON et al., Paris 1997, 297–356.
KAPPLER, C.-C. et al.: Apocalypse de Paul. In: Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I, ed. F. BOVON et al., Paris 1997, 775–826.
KENNEL, G.: Frühchristliche Hymnen? Gattungskritische Studien zur Frage nach den Liedern der frühen Christenheit (WMANT 71), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1995.
KLINGHARDT, M.: Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern (TANZ 13), Tübingen 1996.
KNOPF, R./KRÜGER, G.: Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten (SQS. Neue Folge 3), Tübingen 1929.
KOCH, D.-A.: Die eucharistischen Gebete von Didache 9 und 10 und das Rätsel von Didache 10:6, in: Jesus, Paul, and Early Christianity. Studies in Honour of Henk Jan de Jonge, ed. R. BUITENWERF et al. (NT.S 130), Leiden 2008, 195–210.
KRENTZ, E.: Epideiktik and Hymnody: The New Testament and Its World. In: BR 40 (1995), 50–97.
KROLL, J.: Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandria, Darmstadt (reprint) 1968.
LATTKE, M.: Hymnus. Materialien zu einer Geschichte der antiken Hymnologie (NTOA 19), Fribourg/Göttingen 1991.
LEONHARDT, J.: Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria (TSAJ 84), Tübingen 2001.
LIETZMANN, H.: Messe und Herrenmahl. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie (AKG 8), Bonn 1926.
LÖHR, H.: Studien zum frühchristlichen und frühjüdischen Gebet. Untersuchungen zu 1Clem 59 bis 61 in seinem literarischen, historischen und theologischen Kontext (WUNT 160), Tübingen 2003.
LÖHR, H.: Thronversammlung und preisender Tempel. Beobachtungen am himmlischen Heiligtum im Hebräerbrief und in den Sabbatopferliedern aus Qumran. In: Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt (WUNT 55), ed. M. HENGEL and A. M. SCHWEMER, Tübingen 1991, 185–205.
MUNIER, C. (ed.): Saint Justin. Apologie pour les Chrétiens. Édition et traduction (Par. 39), Fribourg 1995.
MYNORS, R. A. B. (ed.): C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum Libri Decem (SCBO), Oxford 1963.
NORDEN, E.: Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance, vol. 2, Leipzig/Berlin [3]1918.
PULLEYN, S.: Prayer in Greek Religion, Oxford 1997.

RORDORF, W. et. al.: Actes de Paul. In: Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I, ed. F. BOVON et al., Paris 1997, 1115–1177.
RÜGER, H.-P.: Art. Fiebig, Paul. In: NDB 5, Berlin 1961, 139.
SALZMANN, J. C.: Lehren und Ermahnen. Zur Geschichte des christlichen Wortgottesdienstes in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (WUNT II /59), Tübingen 1994.
SCHILLE, G.: Frühchristliche Hymnen, Berlin 1965.
SCHLIER, H.: Der Brief an die Epheser, Düsseldorf [7]1971.
SCHOEDEL, W. R.: Ignatius of Antioch. A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch (Hermeneia), Philadelphia 1985.
SCHWARTZ, E. (ed.), Eusebius Werke. Zweiter Band: Die Kirchengeschichte. Erster Teil: Die Bücher I bis V (GCS 24), Leipzig 1903.
SHOREY, P.: Plato. The Republic. Books VI – X. With an English translation (LCL 276), Cambridge (MA)/London 1935.
SPENGEL, L. (ed.): Rhetores Graeci vol. 3, Leipzig 1856.
STÄHLIN, O./TREU, U. (ed.): Clemens Alexandrinus. Erster Band: Protrepticus und Paedagogus (GCS Clemens Alexandrinus 1), Berlin 1972.
THRAEDE, K.: Art. Hymnus I. In: RAC 16, Stuttgart 1994, 915–946.
THRAEDE, K.: Ursprünge und Formen des “Heiligen Kusses” im frühen Christentum. In: JbAC 11/12 (1968/69), 124–180.
TÓTH, F.: Der himmlische Kult. Wirklichkeitskonstruktion und Sinnbildung in der Johannesoffenbarung (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 22), Leipzig 2006.
VIELHAUER, P.: Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur. Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter, Berlin/New York 1975.
VOLLENWEIDER, S.: Hymnus, Enkomion oder Psalm? Schattengefechte in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft. In: NTS 56 (2010), 208–231.
WENGST, K.: Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums (StNT 7), Gütersloh 1972.
WOLBERGS, T.: Griechische religiöse Gedichte der ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte (BKP 40), Meisenheim am Glan 1971.
WOLTER, M.: Der Brief an die Kolosser. Der Brief an Philemon (ÖTK 12), Gütersloh/Würzburg 1993.

Which Hymns were sung in Ancient Christian Liturgies?

CLEMENS LEONHARD

If anything recited at Christian meetings is regarded as a hymn, the above question is tautological. Ralph BRUCKER's studies have shattered the facile and romantic assumption that passages of elevated style within the prose texts of the New Testament are quotations of hymns that were performed in Christian congregations.[1] There is no reason to assume that those texts, which could not even be regarded as poetry according to ancient standards, ever existed in any other form than as part of their literary context. While BRUCKER's approach emphasizes literary characteristics of certain texts, the assessment of the liturgical contexts in which such texts may or may not have been performed calls for the reconstruction of actual congregational practice. If the alleged hymns were not recited within Christian liturgies, would there have been any singing at all? What would have been sung there? The following essay analyses the character and shape of those liturgies in order to determine which songs could have been used there. Instead of looking for the ancient church's songs in the New Testament, it looks for traces of the social background that could help answer the question of which kinds of songs and hymns would have been sung at such meetings.

In addition, extant texts may reflect aspects of the faith of their authors or performers. This does not necessarily imply that important theological tenets must be expressed in poetic form (rather than in prose). There is also no reason to assume that they would have been performed as songs within rituals (rather than discussed in study groups). Nevertheless, one might assume that formally elevated language should express more sublime contents and that this should come to the fore in their ritualized performance. The following essay asks what the data can be expected to reveal about the liturgical use of ancient Christian hymnography. This procedure helps to overcome the simplistic presumption that ancient

[1] Cf. Ralph BRUCKER's paper in this volume and his book 1997.

theologoumena which are regarded as important today (and assumed to be expressed in e.g. Phil 2:6–11) are taken as models for Christian singing in the apostolic church.

The discussion is divided into four sections. The first section sets the stage, exploring the basic conditions for discovering ancient Christian hymns today. It ends with the assumption that some Christians had good reasons to reject the performance of hymns at least in certain situations. The second section refers to explicit statements against hymns and asks what the late antique texts could offer as replacements for such rejected hymns. Next, it returns to the point of departure of the first section by investigatin the sympotic context of possible Christian performances of hymns and songs. Hence, the third section takes especially the mealtime prayers of the *Didache* as an example for the insertion of extemporized prose in the place where Greek diners would have performed a solemn hymn. The fourth section discusses the literary forms of the mealtime prayers that came to be regarded as central in the apostolic church.

1. Christian Meetings and the Rejection of Certain Greco-Roman Customs

Several ways to reach these objectives seem viable. Many ancient sources claim or imply that Christians were accustomed to singing songs. However, unless supposed songs are marked as such, then such claims cannot be substantiated by the extant sources. Thus, Pliny's letter mentions the Christians' custom to perform a *carmen*.[2] He does not, however, give enough details to specify its contents or the shape of its performance. Other approaches assume that texts like the *Magnificat* or *Benedictus*, which became standard elements in the Liturgy of the Hours of the Middle Ages, were originally composed for the purpose of being sung in the congregations and were always used in this way. Gunter KENNEL (1995) has shown that this assumption is unwarranted. Canonical texts are

[2] "[…] they had met regularly before dawn on a fixed day to chant verses alternately among themselves in honor of Christ as if to a god (*carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem*) […]", Pliny the Younger, *Letter* 10, transl. LCL 59.289 (text 288). Cf. THRAEDE 2004, 175 n. 78 for observations on the context of the statement and the difficulty or even impossibility of reconstructing the shape of Christian musical performances on the basis of this text. *Carmen* does not imply a hymn; BRUCKER 1997, 108ff.

transformed into prayer texts or rewritten to become songs in many epochs of the history of the Churches.

In the Catholic church the alleged hymn in Phil 2 did not become an official liturgical text before the reform of the breviary after the Second Vatican Council. Earlier attestations of single phrases contained in the later texts do not say anything about the age and the performance of those texts (cf. LEHNARDT 2002 for the *Qaddish*). Prayers were composed as parts of networks of older texts. They use intertextual associations to create meaning in a new composition. The first attestation of a line of a later hymn does not, therefore, say anything about the age of that hymn as a text or whether it was part of a liturgy. It is thus necessary to inquire after the character of early Christian gatherings with regard to hymns and songs that were likely performed in their context.

Attempts to reconstruct the early history of Christian hymnography must overcome, furthermore, the essentialist fallacy that asks, "What *is* an ancient Christian hymn?"[3] Instead, it is more useful to suggest plausible scenarios of liturgical contexts for the performance of certain types of texts. These scenarios are based on the assumption that the main occasions and hence the model for early Christian gatherings, were banquets held in a similar manner by Jews, Greeks, Romans, and Christians or a meeting whose ritual structure was derived from and thus resemblant of such banquets.[4]

Chronology also plays an important role. The date of the inscription on a papyrus may or may not indicate the date of the composition of its text. Christian hymnography is well attested from the fourth century on, when the number of hymns increases significantly.[5] Only very few examples of

---

[3] Mary MCGANN (2000) suggests taking the *contents* ("praise" etc.) of certain texts as point of departure for the search for Christian music. However, she studies non-poetic texts from the 4th/5th cent., a reading them as representative also for much earlier times. Rejecting formal characteristics for the identification of "hymns", she even discusses acclamations like "Hallelujah" and the *Sanctus* under this rubric. This essay argues that the *distinction* between hymns and anaphoral texts explains their role in the history of Christian worship – not the identification of these two types of utterances in liturgies.

[4] WILSON 1998 fittingly looks for testimonies pertaining to Christian music in the context of the gatherings of Greco-Roman and Christian associations. Yet, he hardly distinguishes between different occasions that could have required different forms of music, such as the (image of a) sacrifice of an Isis cult in a Temple compared with the meal of a Roman association.

[5] FERGUSON 2004, 146.148 uses the situation of the 4th/5th cent. (Basil, Cassian) as a yardstick for the interpretation of earlier sources. Yet, such anachronistic approaches blur the differences between earlier and later texts and thus create the historical situation that

pre-Constantinian hymns can be adduced. The point in time when the number of old hymns which are also used in later liturgies increases coincides with the demise of the celebration of the Eucharist as a communal banquet. Although the sympotic structure of the Eucharist began to fade away earlier in certain places, it is probable that the artful composition and chanting of hymns follows the creation of large-scale, public forms of Christian liturgies that abandoned the framework of club banquets. In the Middle Ages, the celebration of the Mass as well as the monastic Liturgy of the Hours is a religious event *sui generis*. Neither the mighty or well trained nor the poor or illiterate persons perform rituals that could be classed as belonging to the same genre as the priests' liturgy of the Mass or the monks' performance of the Liturgy of the Hours. Before that time, the celebrations of Christian clubs closely resembled the way in which similar pagan or Jewish groups would organize their meetings. Thus, it must be asked what Greek or Roman clubs or associations were singing *before* that time of the expansion of Christian hymnography (of the fourth century) in order to reconstruct the background for similar phenomena in Christian groups.

The study of ancient Christian meetings – especially in the context of communal meals – reveals that many Christian groups introduced more or less subtle changes into the structures that were customary in their environment. Thus, Adolf VON HARNACK and more recently Andrew MCGOWAN have shown that many Christian groups designed their Eucharistic celebrations in opposition to certain customs and beliefs of their neighbors (cf. MCGOWAN 1999). Many of those groups shunned meat and wine, the two most important and typical ingredients of pagan festive offerings and banquets. The substitution of bread and wine or water for meat and wine was perceived as a powerful statement against the behavior and system of values of the surrounding society. The theoretical rejection of public sacrifices and other displays of violence and cruelty in Roman society were transformed into the practice of the avoidance of the cuisine of sacrifice. Such a counter-statement only works, however, if large parts of the rest of the ritual context remain intact. This is corroborated by the fact that Christians were not the only groups that used this manner of communal practice and social communication. Pythagoreans and later Rabbis also held symposia and introduced significant changes into the course of the ritualized acts of the formal meal. Christian congregations did not invent

---

they claim to find in the sources. FERGUSON does not take into account a possible sympotic setting of a Christian performance of songs.

something new, but hallmarked their celebrations in their own characteristic ways.

The abstention from wine among many Christian communities understood as an expression of the rejection of certain features of the surrounding society corresponds to the rejection of musical instruments by Christian writers. Especially the flute seemed to them associated too closely with the pagan cult too closely to be adaptable to Christian artistic expression or entertainment.[6] Their position towards hymns is more complex, because some authors recommend singing instead of instrumental music. Yet, their pagan neighbors both listened to the flute and sang hymns at solemn occasions.

The observations regarding the abstention from wine (or the rejection of instrumental music) elucidate the history of songs and hymns which could have been recited at certain points during Christian meetings, since many Greek songs mention or are addressed to Greek and Roman gods.[7]

Christians had essentially two ways to react in a situation where they did not feel comfortable reciting such texts. They could have developed a similar system like the Rabbis' approach to idol worship (*avoda zara*), since songs could be defined as mere decoration and hence as devoid of any religiously relevant meaning. In such a case, one could just continue to sing the same songs and ignore the religious implications. While this can never be ruled out regarding single communities, the data rather suggest that Christians tended to replace their Greek and Roman neighbors' hymns and songs with other compositions. An analysis of ancient sources must, therefore, look for traces of texts that might have been used as replacements in this sense. Such replacements must roughly fit into the context of normal Greco-Roman banquets but they must also differ from what was customary in these banquets in significant ways.

Greco-Roman hymns could just have been reworded but performed in similar ways. Like their rejection of the consumption of wine, many Christian groups before Constantine regarded the mere form of pagan hymns as incompatible with Christian performances.

---

[6] Cf. QUASTEN 1973, 78–84.176 but also 103–110.161f for the acceptance of zither and lyre. Cf. COSGROVE 2006, 260 referring to Quasten and McKinnon's interpretation of the opposition of the ancient Christian writers against musical instruments.

[7] Cf. *Apostolic Constitutions* 5.10.2 and METZGER 2000, 59 n. 2.

2. Dangerous Hymns and Early Christian Hymnography

Some Christian sources show a clear disdain for hymns and urge their audience to abide by the reading or recitation of "psalms". In such cases, the reference to "psalms" refers to the biblical book of Psalms. Hymns and songs are regarded as dangerous because they express heretical positions in beautiful language and make the hearts of the singers and listeners deviate from the truth. In this situation, texts like (probably) Tertullian or the Synod of Laodicea (of the fourth century) demand that one should turn to the biblical book of Psalms in congregational performances.

The purpose of the statement of the Synod of Laodicea, which is repeated in similar contexts, is not clear: "No psalms composed by private individuals (ἰδιωτικοί ψαλμοί) nor any uncanonical books may be read (λέγεσθαι) in the church, but only the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments".[8] The following canon 60 gives a list of canonical books. Thus, it is not clear whether this canon is at all interested in songs in addition to lections. Moreover, if this and similar statements were designed to abolish the creation and performance of non-biblical poetry for Christian liturgies, then they utterly failed.[9] For, at the time when these statements were produced and repeated, the first great and well accepted Christian poets flourished. Even if it is unknown for which purposes or liturgical contexts Ephrem the Syrian wrote his *madrāšē*, these compositions eventually entered the liturgical canon of the Syriac churches. Ephrem was all but a heretic and many *madrāšē* were also translated into other languages.

Criticism of non-biblical songs is motivated by the notion that music transports ideology and is hence a means of propaganda and the manipulation of listeners. While this may reflect actual observations, it may also be based on nothing but old clichés. When Plato constructs his totalitarian phantasies for a dictatorship of philosophers, he takes great care to fasten the state's grip on poetry.[10] All performances of poetry must be regarded as propaganda. Public statements are heresy if they deviate from the stan-

[8] Can. 59; HEFELE 1907, 1025; transl. NPNF 2.14.158.

[9] Texts like the can. 59 should not, therefore, be taken as a testimony for the general abolition of non-biblical songs in the churches as suggested e.g. by HENGEL 2006, 219f. The analysis of the sympotic context of early Christian singing is more significant and explains more features of the sources than the search for certain motives – like Christology (according to HENGEL 2006) – in the texts.

[10] Esp. in the second and third books of *Politeia*; cf. COSGROVE 2006, 270–276.

dards regarding contents and form. In the wake of such ideas, uncanonical hymns are suspicious.

The opposite approach – namely the composition of orthodox hymns for the sake of spreading orthodoxy (instead of turning to canonical and hence undisputable texts for recitation) – can be seen as early as the third century when great theological scholars are praised for the composition of orthodox hymns against the heretical ones.[11]

Some of the early so-called heretical pieces are preserved. Hippolytus quotes these works in his heresiological treatise. Two metric compositions are attributed to the heretic Naassenes and the Gnostic Valentinus. In the same epoch, Clement of Alexandria writes his own Christological poem.[12] These compositions fit well into to their Greek literary context (HERZHOFF 1973). One must not accept the systematization of such sources as heretic or orthodox. Second century Alexandrian theologians designed their own approaches to – and syntheses of – their Jewish, Christian, and philosophical literary heritage, many of which were labeled as "Gnostic". They represent (especially Alexandrian) Christianity as a religion of intellectuals and philosophers (cf. FÜRST 2007). In those circles, one may envisage someone presenting a sophisticated literary composition to his fellows at a meeting of their philosophical club. There is no indication that such texts had any function within a setting of ritualized practice. Such a performance may belong to the same category as the presentation of other pieces of rhetoric, intellectual entertainment, the art of creating an edifying conversation at the table, or a philosophical or theological insight shared with the group on the occasion. Furthermore, Hippolytus' source for these poems was most likely *written*, not based on his memory of an oral performance. Theological poems could also be created for private, silent reading.

---

[11] About Jacob of Serugh (451–521): "The mēmrē which he composed [allegedly 763, extant: 300] in order that through a pleasant composition of exciting expressions he could snatch the mass from the illustrious one", VÖÖBUS 1965, 66f translating NAU 1913, 612 [124]. About Narsai (died at the beginning of the 6th cent.): "What then did the elect of God do? … he put the truthful thought of orthodoxy into the elaborate form of the mēmrē to pleasant melodies and he composed the sense of the Scriptures according to the holy fathers, in pleasant responses in the likeness of the blessed David", ibid.

[12] The text is set in meter. The hymn is only missing in one ms. at the end of the *Paedagogus*; MONDÉSERT, MATRAY, MARROU 1970, 192–207. Although Clement's authorship cannot be proven, there is no reason to doubt this attribution; cf. WOLBERGS 1971, 85f.

This explains the existence but also the scarcity of the extant data. The repertoire was very specific and closely connected with a certain person, group, and situation. These texts only rarely entered the process of the preservation and transmission of literary texts. No worldwide authority could decree that such a text had to be regarded as important and had to be performed in liturgies. A few Christians had already written their own hymns long before Constantine. They bear witness to their writers' literary aspirations and education, sometimes to specialties of their beliefs. It is not clear whether they were written in order to be performed or in order to be read silently. Their specific role within the customs and rituals performed at the meeting of philosophical clubs cannot be recovered. In terms of tradition, they did not have any impact on the later attested history of Christian hymnography.

Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* contains a passage that quotes an anonymous writing against a certain heretic Artemon. The quoted text, which is set in the early third century, asks in a rhetorical question whether anyone would seriously deny that *psalms* and *odes* were *written* as *hymning* Christ as God's logos "from the beginning".[13] The basic validity of the claim should not be doubted here. While Eusebius does not, unfortunately, give any details regarding those hymns, it is remarkable that the text says that those odes were *written* and that Eusebius does not hint at any performance. In the preceding line, he refers to *books* which proclaim Christ. Thus, the *psalms* and *odes* are quoted as witnesses to early Christian theological thinking and writing, not to primordial rituals.

Tertullian's remarks could make his reader believe that every Christian was reciting psalms at home. He claims that the Christian husband and wife sing psalms and hymns – privately.[14] Such remarks do not refer to music chanted by the Christian congregation. The third chapter of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (3:7:7) lists virtues for widows, which include among other things singing – ψαλλεῖν. The text quotes Eph 5:19 which

[13] "And how many psalms and hymns, written (γραφεῖσαι) by the faithful brethren from the beginning, celebrate (ὑμνοῦσιν) Christ the Word of God, speaking of him as Divine (θεολογοῦντες)", *Ecclesiastical History* 5.28.5 transl. NPNF 2.1 247.

[14] *Sonant* inter duos *psalmi et hymni, et mutuo prouocant, quis melius domino suo cantet*; *Ad Uxorem* 2.8 CCL 1.394. Christ is the audience. The songs are not performed for or in front of a congregation: *talia Christus uidens et audiens gaudet*. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 7.7/35.6 SChr 428.130f who just praises the "gnostic" – i.e. the spiritually most advanced person – who sings hymns during his work as a farmer or sailor (γεωργοῦμεν αἰνοῦντες, πλέομεν ὑμνοῦντες). He emphasizes that this gnostic does not sing at special places, at appointed times or in certain ritual contexts.

mentions ᾠδή and ὕμνος. The widow should engage in this kind of hymn-singing incessantly. Thus, the reciting of psalms or similar kinds of texts is the widows' (that means: the religious specialists') virtuous habit. It is just not a liturgy. The *Apostolic Constitutions* understood Eph 5:19 accurately.

Λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς can be translated as "speaking to one another [in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs…]". Yet, Eph 5:19 as well as its parallel (and perhaps its source), Col 3:16, says that this "singing" is done in one's heart – ἐν[15] τῇ καρδίᾳ/ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις. "In the heart(s)" is generally interpreted as an indication that this singing expresses one's inner disposition and true intentions.[16] Thus, commentators understand ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ as "by means of the heart" implying "out of the heart". However, they regard Christian and Jewish congregational singing of hymns as a given and presuppose that texts like Eph 5:19 refer to this setting. Such bits of interpretation presuppose what they intend to prove. The same is true for the use of Phil 2:6–11. The assumption that texts like Phil 2:6–11 should be quotations of ancient Christian hymns is often used as an argument in favor of the Christian congregational singing of hymns.[17] This presumption requires considerable support by means of data. It must not merely be presupposed.

Apart from the alleged New Testament hymns mentioned here, Eckhard SCHNABEL (2011, 337) mentions 1 Cor 14, Eph 5/Col 3 and some passages of the book of Revelation as proof texts for Christian congregational singing. While 1 Cor 14 probably reflects the situation of the congregational symposium, the alleged hymns in Revelation describe a heavenly liturgy that need not be connected to any contemporary practice.

Furthermore, two of the very rare instances of the use of the term "hymn" in the New Testament (in Eph 5 and Col 3) do not imply public

---

[15] The majority of mss. read (obviously regarded as *lectio facilior* by the editions and commentators) ἐν … in *Eph* 5:19. In *Col* 3:16, ἐν is read by all witnesses.

[16] QUASTEN 1973, 79; SCHNABEL 2011, 315. Cf. on *Eph* 5:19: SELLIN 2008, 423 ("Das Herz wird zum Instrument des Singens und Preisens."); BEST 1998, 513 ("This worship is not silent worship in the heart … but worship offered from the heart where the Spirit dwells …"). The commentators regard ἐν in Eph as secondary. Tertullian would have expressed that notion as *de pectore oramus* – publicly, but not with hymns and without the official supervisor of ritual standards (*sine monitore*), *Apologeticum* 30.4 CCL 1.141.19.

[17] Cf. SCHNABEL 2011, 337 n. 148 who even (mis-) quotes KENNEL 1995 and BRUCKER 1997 in support of the interpretation of texts like Phil 2:6–11 as Christian hymns.

singing. Rather, they refer to private spiritual exercises, or to a silent virtue, perhaps even a metaphor for a virtuous disposition in more general terms.[18] They were also understood as such in its history of reception. As Charles COSGROVE (2006, 268f) points out, this approach to appointed times or sacred space makes Christian life a "perpetual liturgy". This notion was shared by Christian and pagan thinkers. It is also reflected in New Testament texts (cf. Rom 12:1; Col 2:16f reworking Gal 4:8–11). Such statements do not, therefore, elucidate Christian liturgical singing. They rather reflect many Christians' opposition to pagan music – including hymns – and the celebration of appointed times.

The authors of the late fourth century *Apostolic Constitutions* know that the biblical Psalms are recited in public liturgies at several occasions. Yet, METZGER observes that this text hardly speaks about hymns and psalms at all. He infers from this that their compiler did not see any problems that required his intervention (2000, 62). This does not answer the question of what role hymns (as distinct from the biblical book of Psalms) should have played in the liturgy. Furthermore, the church order only quotes several long prayer texts. At some point during the process of the transmission of this text, three pieces of the seventh chapter were designated as hymns (apart from two shorter acclamations[19]): the "Hymn of the morning" (ὕμνος ὀρθρινός 7:47); "of the evening" (ἑσπερινός 7:48); and "for the meal" (ἐπ' ἀρίστῳ 7:49). The compiler appended them to a list of bishops. They are not surrounded by more elaborate rubrics for a liturgical service. The piece that is labeled as "Hymn of the morning" is (together with the Codex Alexandrinus of the 5th cent.) one of the oldest witnesses to a form of *Gloria in excelsis*. The text that the heading regards as suitable "for the evening" is a prayer followed by the *Nunc dimittis*. The following so-called "table prayer" is likewise an anthology of verses from the Bible.

These prayers reflect the fashion of reciting Scriptural texts or florilegia. In the same epoch, another unpoetic and purely literary prayer text entered the public liturgies: the Lord's Prayer (cf. TAFT 1997). The

---

[18] This is corroborated by the following verse 20 in the same chapter (*Eph* 5), which advises everyone to thank God in the name of Christ for everything (ὑπὲρ πάντων). Although the author of the letter mentioned the drinking of wine in v. 18 (and thus evokes the atmosphere of the congregation's banquet) the following injunctions refer to more or less ritualized behavior *as a habit* and not to a congregational *ritual*. On meditating or singing as proper response to all kinds of situations and not connected to any liturgy, cf. James 5:13 and Acts 16:25.

[19] The biblical *Trishagion* (8.12.27, 7.35.3) and acclamations during the liturgy of the Eucharist (7.26.5, 8.13.11–13); METZGER 2000, 63–65.

position of these texts in the collection also shows that they are more recent additions to a core of text that could not be changed any more.

METZGER (cf. 2000, 71) remarks that the hymnic compositions collected in the *Apostolic Constitutions* are little developed. Their wording hardly contrasts with the Psalter and the acclamations of the Bible. The authors of this text were not, apparently, interested in the distinction of this material from the biblical Psalms. On the contrary, they wanted to present themselves as a new Israel that continued the scriptural way of praising God (METZGER 2000, 67). In the *Gloria in excelsis*, a few theological remarks are added to biblical material. These so-called hymns are not, furthermore, in any respect metric compositions. It is also unclear who was in charge of reciting them. Like the wording of biblical Psalms, which hardly ever betrays a possible liturgical setting of its performance, a hymn or prayer can be used and interpreted in many different ways and sung by persons to whom the text does not make any reference (cf. METZGER 2000, 67f.71).

How should this state of affairs in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and other texts up to its epoch be explained? It precedes the widespread use of the composition of hymns from Ephrem's *madrāšē* on. In addition, the singing of the *Magnificat* or *Benedictus* is not yet envisaged. If these latter two pieces were not recited in the liturgies (except for situations where they were read as part of their biblical context), they were still regarded as literature in a narrow sense and not parts of a liturgy. The text of the *Apostolic Constitutions* does not, in any case, use the term "hymn" to refer to a *metric* text and it does not imply a more precise liturgical setting for such "hymns" than "upon the meal" and the like.

Before the age of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Christians wrote hymns that other Greeks would have recognized as such. There is no indication that such hymns were composed for congregational singing. For the present purpose, the text of the *Apostolic Constitutions* must be regarded as late. With the benefit of hindsight, it can be observed that the *Apostolic Constitutions* reflect the inception of the use of hymns in Christian liturgies. Now, Christian texts quote hymns, which are not metric and which are still clumsily made up of scraps of biblical text. Thus, one must ask again about possible liturgical antecedents of this practice or rather the reasons for the absence of such antecedents.

3. Sympotic Singing in Ancient Christianity

Which songs did Christians perform in the earlier epochs? The most plausible point to begin with is 1 Cor 14:26f: "What then brethren? When you

come together each one has a psalm, has a teaching, has a revelation, has a tongue, has an interpretation." The remark "each one has a psalm…" fits well with situations that are described in other examples of sympotic literature. Plutarch mentions the singing of σκόλια where each participant in the symposium would contribute a song to the common entertainment.[20] Plutarch distinguishes between the *paean* and the *skolion*, both of which should also have been accompanied by different musical instruments. The *paean* is said to have been sung by all members of the group while the *skolion* would normally be presented by one member of the group for the benefit (or entertainment) of all others. *Skolia* may cover a wide range of topics and would normally be metric.

Paul mentions several kinds of contributions to the symposium as useful and welcome. Regarding the question of the origins and traditions of Christian liturgical songs, where should one look for "the" Christian *skolion*? While the New Testament does not contain such metric pieces, it would also not be expected that, for instance, Paul should record a *skolion* that a certain person had sung at this or that meeting. The contribution of a member of the community – whether improvised on the spot, composed at home, or learned from someone else – would not, furthermore, qualify as the main focus for the construction of the congregation's identity.[21] Of

---

[20] Plutarch, *Quaestiones Conviviales* (*Moralia* 8) 1.1.5/615B–C transl. LCL 424.23, describes the mode of singing the *skolia*: "As for the scolia […] that first the guests would sing the god's song together, all raising their hymn with one voice (*πρῶτον* μὲν ᾖδον ᾠδὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κοινῶς ἅπαντες μιᾷ φωνῇ παιανίζοντες), and next (δεύτερον) when to each in turn was given the myrtle spray […] and thus the scolium owes its name to the fact that it is not sung by all and is not easy." Probably reworking Plutarch's statement, Clement of Alexandria rejects musical instruments and favors singing instead. Yet, he confuses the terminology (παιανίζω), the mode of performance, and the occasion; *Paedagogus* 2.4/44.3 SChr 108.94f; cf. QUASTEN 1973, 97; COSGROVE 2006, 261f. It is all the more significant that Clement compares the singing of biblical Psalms with the *skolion* (that is sung "second" in order according to Plutarch) not with the "ode to the god" (apparently a *paean*, which is sung "first"). COSGROVE 2006, 262f assumes that Clement prefers the Christians to sing *paeans*, although he only reflects a literary, not an actually performed musical tradition. If one does not take Clement's use of παιανίζω as strictly a technical term, emphasizing rather his reference to Plutarch's *skolia*, psalm singing belongs to the performances of the drinking party after the meal. It does not replace the solemn transitory ritual between meal and post-prandial conversation. For literary examples, cf. VAN DER VALK 1974, who reviews the *skolia* quoted by Athenaeus.

[21] Cf. KLINGHARDT 1996, 387f and his reference to Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39.18f CCL 1.153, where everyone can be called forth (*provocatur* – as a single performer singing in front of the congregation without requiring that the congregation sings as a whole) to sing from the Holy Scriptures or according to his own ability and talent after

course, one would perform an edifying text that pleases one's fellow diners. Its theological implications would generally be acceptable for the congregation, but it would not be a dogmatic treatise.

As soon as a *paean* was supposed to be sung by the whole congregation and hence regarded as more solemn in religious terms than a *skolion*, one would expect to find the production and proliferation of the typically Christian hymns for exactly this occasion. Paul and Luke describe Jesus' ritual manipulation of the chalice after the meal. They do not describe something like a *paean* or a psalm. Did Christians abandon the singing of *paeans* as integral parts of their formal banquets?[22]

Matthias KLINGHARDT interprets *Didache* 10:6 as quoting two *incipits* of liturgical songs: "Let grace come and let this world pass away" and "Hosanna to the God of David". KLINGHARDT quotes a long list of parallels that support the assumption that "Let grace come" could be a plausible beginning for a song. The two songs replace the *paean* according to KLINGHARDT (1996, 399f). The conclusion of the meal has, however, already been marked by means of the prayer of *Didache* 10 that precedes these two songs. Thus, it seems that the author of the *Didache* wanted the congregations for whom he composed his treatise to replace the *paean* as well as the other ritualized elements of the conclusion of the meal with the prayers of chapter 10, not with another hymn. "Let grace come and let this world pass away" and "Hosanna to the God of David" may thus be understood as songs of the congregation to be performed within the ensuing sympotic meeting and not as the replacement for the central religious performance of the normal Greek banquet. The text of *Didache* 10:6 was not understood as the incipits of hymns by the authors of the *Apostolic Constitutions* who reworked and expanded the *Didache* some 250 years after its composition. The alleged songs did not, likewise, leave any trace in the further history of the Christian liturgies. Nevertheless, KLING-

---

the meal and during the drinking party (*post aquam manualem et lumina*) – a practice that highlights the sobriety of Tertullian's congregation.

[22] HENGEL 2006, 213 refers to Mark 14:26 and Matt 26:30 as evidence for the performance of the *Hallel* at the end of the celebration of Pesach; cf. against this identification STEMBERGER 1987, 154f. There are no indications that the *Hallel* should have been sung in the way that the Rabbis designed the rituals of the *Seder* after the destruction of the Temple. Before that time, "the *Hallel*" was sung by the Levites in the Temple during the slaughtering of the Pesach animals, *mPes* 5.7. The extent of the *Hallel* is unknown. The Mishnah only quotes the beginning of Ps 116. According to the Tosefta, the *Hallel* is one of the very few pieces of biblical text which the Rabbis assume that only very few people could recite, *tPes* 10. 6.

HARDT's explanation of *Didache* 10 remains plausible,[23] since the absence of a reception history of the two alleged songs just supports their character as literary pieces of lesser importance.

One may wonder why the redactor of the *Didache* transmitted what we would understand today as pre- and post-prandial Eucharistic *prayer* texts but no hymn. This can be explained on the basis of the following observations. The *Didache* allows the "prophets" to use their own texts or improvise the Eucharistic prayers. The advice to use the prayer texts of the *Didache* does not concern these "prophets" but other persons of the community, presumably the presidents of the congregation. They should abide by the text of the Eucharistic prayer as it is written. Thus, the central prayers which were normally improvised or whose wording was at the president's discretion attract the attention of the author of the *Didache*. The presumable readers of the text are the only ones that are likely to be influenced by it. The Didachist does not even try to change the ways of the prophets who might occasionally visit the congregation. The president's prayer texts did not follow a universal standard and could be changed without any poetic competence. If *Didache* 10:6 should refer to songs that were performed by more than one singer, they would likewise have been more stable, well known to several people, and less prone to changes on the basis of a commandment of this short book. In this case, the Didachist replaced a hymnic text with a definitely non-hymnic piece of prose. The typically Christian *paean*, libation, etc. is not a typically Christian hymn, but a presider's extemporized statement.

4. Sympotic Praying Instead of Singing

Poetic texts that were written for use in the liturgies are absent from the literary record of ancient Christianity, although rubrics and suggestions for prose prayer texts survived. Three observations may explain their absence apart from the fact that only very few pagan texts of this genre also survived.

---

[23] KLINGHARDT's 1996, (chapter VI) esp. 380–402 interpretation of *Didache* 10 is more plausible than Lietzmann's, who interprets the lines as a dialogue between the president and the congregation before receiving communion. Lietzmann's reconstructed dialogue does not appear in any other liturgy and he must abandon the structure of the meal in the *Didache*, because he assumes that the important, sacramental part of the food was consumed after the prayer of *Didache* 10.

First, the set of rituals at the end of a Christian communal meal remotely resembles the rabbinic *birkat ha-mazon*. *Birkat ha-mazon* was expanded and embellished in the Middle Ages – *after* the demise of the formerly ubiquitous custom to hold symposia in several strata of the society. Although the rabbis do not give the exact text, they make it clear that it consists of three or four *brakhot*, not hymns. Otherwise, the rabbis describe the structure of their meals in Hellenistic terms (cf. *tBer* 4f). It may thus be supposed that they added new ritualized performances and dropped pagan elements of the table etiquette depending on whether those could be brought in line with their own principles. Although the introduction of *birkat ha-mazon* indicates that this stage within the meal was of high importance, the sages apparently did not bother to compose an appropriate *paean*. It may be assumed that the whole genre – contents, form, and music – was regarded as utterly pagan, rejected en bloc, and replaced by the *brakhot*.

Second, Christians also did not replace all the elements of pagan table etiquette. They seem to have avoided the performance of a *paean*, together with the libations and the sound of the flute, which one could regard as an indispensible part of this performance.[24] Neither does Justin, who has recently been re-interpreted as reflecting a type of Eucharistic celebration that opposes pagan practices in its performance, mention hymns or psalms in his description of the Eucharist as celebrated on the "Day of Helios". The president of Justin's community recites "prayers" as much as he can.[25] He does not sing songs. The same is true for the congregation. The central and only prayer also *precedes* the consumption of the meal and it is performed by one person on behalf of all. The solo performance is necessary, because the president improvises this prayer. It seems that Justin's congregation (together with many others) did not only reject the cuisine of sacrifice, as observed by Andrew MCGOWAN, but also its music as pagan. This rejection did not only result in theological censorship of customary texts, but also in the rejection of their performance en bloc. Conversely, the *Didache* only advises the replacement of the *paean* with another set of prayers by the president. The ancient sources agree in their rejection of hymns in general. They did not, apparently, regard the mere form and genre as neutral.

---

[24] Cf. Plutarch, *Quaestiones Conviviales* 7.8.4/713A–B LCL 425.86f.

[25] His prayer contains αἶνον καὶ δόξα τῷ πατρὶ […] and εὐχαριστία, *1 Apol* 65.3 and cf. 67.5. The whole process is designated as εὐχαί.

The recension of the *Traditio Apostolica* that underlies its Ethiopic translation provides a further very illuminating example. While many of its liturgical rules reflect fourth century practice only, it seems nevertheless to have preserved older material – especially in those sections that deal with ecclesiastic banquets. Fourth century Christians would, of course, continue to hold banquets. Yet their theological attention concentrated on the Mass, which was no longer a banquet. Thus, several rules of the *Traditio Apostolica* appear as anachronistic in the fourth century. One of those parts instructs the readers:[26]

> With the bishop present, when evening has come, a deacon is to bring in a lamp, and, standing among all the faithful who are there, he is to give thanks. [Introduction, Prayer over the lamp] … And when they have then risen after the supper and have prayed, the children and the virgins are to say the psalms. After this, a deacon, holding the mixed cup of the oblation, is to say a psalm from the ones over which 'Hallelujah' is written. And after this a presbyter, if he has commanded, [is to read] in this way from those psalms…

The rituals described here take place after the meal and manipulate wine, which is presumably drunk on this occasion during the meeting. The whole scene or the first parts of it could be read as a replacement ritual for the singing of a *paean* and for the pouring of libations. Yet, the "psalms" are recited by individuals or choirs. The brief remark, "when they have then risen *after the supper and have prayed*", rather seems to indicate that the end of the meal was already celebrated by prayer instead of the common recitation of poetic but pagan compositions. Now the congregation turns to other pious acts. They may now listen to someone who recites a psalm – whether biblical or not. The singing of psalms at this banquet does not function as a replacement for the customary solemn Greek hymns. That replacement seems to have been performed already.

Third, the recitation of a *paean* as well as the singing of *skolia* or the presentation of a psalm did not leave traces in later liturgies, because the celebration of symposia gave way to other forms of liturgies during the third century. Perhaps already in Tertullian's and certainly in Cyprian's time, the majority of the Christians in Carthage met in the morning at the bishop's house in order to receive consecrated food and wine (or water). They were supposed to consume at least part of it on the spot but could also take home part of the consecrated bread. In this setting, the typical roles and expected behavior of participants at communal meals was out of place. The bishop may have recited prayers on that occasion or given an

---

[26] *Traditio Apostolica* 29C; BRADSHAW/JOHNSON/PHILLIPS 2002, 156f.

explanatory speech. He would not have sung a post-prandial hymn, because most of the people who lined up in order to receive the consecrated food were most likely gone by the time everyone had received a share.

Besides the meeting for the distribution of consecrated bread, the communities held other meetings. Hardly anything is known about their liturgical shape. As soon as descriptions of Christian communal daily prayers emerge, they refer to the use of biblical Psalms and prayers. These meetings were social institutions *sui generis* and did not provide the background for a survival of formerly sympotic compositions. With the growing standardization of the aesthetic arrangement of the liturgy of the Mass as well as the liturgies of hours, Christian poets began to write *new* texts for *new* occasions. Some of these texts still survive in liturgical use today. As a result of the early rejection of pagan poetic compositions, texts that were regarded as central and effective in the course of the liturgy were not only composed in prose. Even authors of such compositions emphasize that these texts are not fixed and should not be standardized. This kind of prose was improvised on principle for a long time (cf. BOULEY 1981, BUDDE 2001). It is an unpoetic and likely an even anti-poetic trace in Medieval and modern liturgies that these prayers continue to be elevated prose but not poetry.

The lack of attested hymns in early Christianity is, therefore, neither the result of the coincidences of transmission nor the inability of early Christianity to produce sophisticated poetic texts. It reflects the conscious rejection of a literary and religious custom of the society in which they lived.

5. Conclusions

The sympotic background of the most important Christian liturgies helps to understand the structure of the extant data. It suggests explanations for the absence and presence of compositions and their social context and avoids anachronistic readings of much later evidence. In the first centuries after Constantine, Christian congregations and clubs replaced the most solemn hymnic and hence poetic element of Greek and Roman banquets with prose texts that were improvised or at least chosen by the presidents. This does not exclude the performance of pieces of music or the recitation of poetry during these meetings. Those poetic performances did not, however, reach the same level of dignity as the pieces of rhetoric prose. Hardly any examples of the non-standardized and often improvised texts have survived. Tending to be spontaneous, they were dependent upon the

individual situation and of little interest for other situations and groups. In addition, none of the popular songs were preserved. They were neither important nor did many congregations use the same texts. In rare cases, Christian intellectuals composed sophisticated poetry with theological interests. Those did not gain wider acceptance and there are no indications when and how often they crossed the boundary between written literature and oral performance as part of a liturgy, because there was simply no liturgical background that would have required their repeated performance and wider dissemination.

The equivalents to modern pieces of liturgical poetry, chants, and hymns began to develope in post-Constantinian times when the Mass and the Liturgy of the Hours became public performances in the city hall, having grown away from the banquets in the dining room. At that time, the biblical Psalms, texts that resembled the Psalms or were even composed in their wake, other pieces of biblical texts, and newly created poetry or prose prayers emerged as parts of this liturgy and began to appear detached from their literary context and surrounded with rubrics that hint at liturgical use.

The presupposition that important theological statements should have been sung or recited in poetic form during the liturgies is too simplistic to be of any historical significance. The proclivity to repeat over and over at every major meeting the decisions of councils about the boundaries of orthodoxy belongs to much later epochs. Those creedal formulas are, furthermore, prose expressions of a theological consensus and not poetic texts. They are not performed as songs. Early Christianity did not sing its theology during its congregational meetings.

These observations also support the validity of Ralph BRUCKER's analyses of epideictic passages in the New Testament into the post-biblical church. Texts like Phil 2:5–11 are anything but ancient Christian liturgical hymns, simply because there was no Christian liturgy that required their performance. On the contrary and similar to other forms of opposition of the Early Church against the Greek and Roman ways of life, many Christians regarded not only the contents but also the forms of hymnic performances as typically pagan. Thus, they rejected the invocation of the gods together with its musical form and vice versa. This does not mean that Christians of that epoch did not sing songs or abstained from writing poetry. Those were just not regarded as important or solemn elements of the agendas at their meetings. This is the reason why the music of the early church is lost.

Bibliography

BEST, E.: Ephesians (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary), Edinburgh 1998.

BOULEY, A.: From Freedom to Formula. The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts (The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity 21), Washington 1981.

BRADSHAW, P. F./JOHNSON, M. E./PHILLIPS, L. E.: The Apostolic Tradition. A Commentary (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 2002.

BRUCKER, R.: ‘Christushymnen‘ oder ‘epideiktische Passagen‘? Studien zum Stilwechsel im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt (FRLANT 176), Göttingen 1997.

BUDDE, A.: Improvisation im Eucharistiegebet. Zur Technik freien Betens in der Alten Kirche. In: JbAC 44 (2001), 127–141.

COSGROVE, C. H.: Clement of Alexandria and Early Christian Music. In: JECS 14 (2006), 255–282.

FERGUSON, E.: Congregational singing in the Early Church. In: Acta Patristica et Byzantina 15 (2004), 144–159.

FÜRST, A.: Christentum als Intellektuellen-Religion. Die Anfänge des Christentums in Alexandria (SBS 213), Stuttgart 2007.

HEFELE, C. J.: Histoire des conciles. Tome I. Deuxième Partie. Paris 1907.

HENGEL, M.: Das Christuslied im frühesten Gottesdienst. In: id.. Studien zur Christologie. Kleine Schriften IV (WUNT 201), ed. C.-J. THORNTON, Tübingen 2006, 205–258 = Weisheit Gottes – Weisheit der Welt (FS Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger), ed. W. BAIER (ed.), St. Ottilien 2006, I, 357–404.

HERZHOFF, B.: Zwei Gnostische Psalmen. Interpretation und Untersuchung von Hippolytus, Refutatio V 10, 2 und VI 37, 7, Bonn 1973 (manuscript).

KENNEL, G.: Frühchristliche Hymnen? Gattungskritische Studien zur Frage nach den Liedern der frühen Christenheit (WMANT 71), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1995.

KLINGHARDT, M.: Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern (TANZ 13), Tübingen 1996.

LEHNARDT, A.: Qaddisch. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Rezeption eines rabbinischen Gebetes (TSAJ 87), Tübingen 2002.

MCGANN, M. E.: Hymn and Anaphora in Early Christian Liturgy. In: EO 17 (2000), 407–443.

MCGOWAN, A.: Ascetic Eucharists. Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals (Oxford Early Christian Studies), Oxford 1999.

METZGER, M.: Expressions hymniques dans les ‘Constitutions Apostoliques’. In: L’hymnographie. Conférences Saint-Serge. XLVIe semaine d’études liturgiques. Paris, 29 Juin – 2 Juillet 1999, ed. A. M. TRIACCA/A. PISTOIA (Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae. Subsidia 105), Roma 2000, 59–71.

MONDÉSERT, C./MARROU, H.-I.: Clément d’Alexandrie. Le Pédagogue. Livre III (SC 158), Paris 1970.

NAU, F.: Histoire de Barḥadbešabba ‘Arbaïa et controverse de Théodore de Mopsueste avec les Macédoniens […] (PO 9.5), Paris 1913.

QUASTEN, J.: Musik und Gesang in den Kulten der heidnischen Antike und christlichen Frühzeit (LGF 25), Münster ²1973.

SCHNABEL, E. J.: Singing and Instrumental Music in the Early Church. In: Sprache lieben – Gottes Wort verstehen. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese, ed. W. HILBRANDS (FS Heinrich von Siebenthal = Bibelwissenschaftliche Monographien 17), Gießen 2011, 309–341.

SELLIN, G.: Der Brief an die Epheser (KEK 8), Göttingen [9]2008.
STEMBERGER, G.: Pesachhaggada und Abendmahlsberichte des Neuen Testaments. In: Kairos 29 (1987), 147–158 = id.: Studien zum rabbinischen Judentum (SBAB 10), Stuttgart 1987, 357–374.
TAFT, R. F.: The Lord's Prayer in the Eucharistic Liturgy. When and Why? In: EO 13 (1997), 137–155.
THRAEDE, K.: Noch einmal: Plinius d. J. und die Christen. In: ZNW 95 (2004), 102–128.
VAN DER VALK, M.: On the Composition to the Attic Skolia. In: Hermes 102 (1974), 1–20.
VÖÖBUS, A.: History of the School of Nisibis (CSCO 266), Louvain 1965.
WILSON, S. G.: Early Christian music. In: Common life in the early church (FS Graydon F. Snyder), ed. J. V. HILLS et al., Harrisburg 1998, 390–401.
WOLBERGS, T.: Griechische religiöse Gedichte der ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte. Vol. 1, Psalmen und Hymnen der Gnosis und des frühen Christentums (BKP 40). Meisenheim am Glan 1971.

Hymns and Prayers in the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas

GERARD ROUWHORST

It is only fairly recently that the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles have been recognized as particularly valuable sources of information concerning early Christian ritual traditions and practices. For long, they were more or less neglected by the majority of liturgical scholars and, more in general, by most specialists in early Christianity. Since the last few decades of the last century, however, there has been a growing interest in the liturgical scenes and elements that are part of these sources which must reflect existing liturgical practices in one way or another. One may mention here more in particular the extensive studies by KLIJN,[1] WINKLER[2] and others that have been devoted to the rites of initiation described in the Acts of Thomas. The Eucharistic meals described in the apocryphal Acts, especially in those of Thomas, have received a lot of attention as well in studies published by WINKLER,[3] MESSNER,[4] MCGOWAN[5] and myself.[6] Recently, MYERS has devoted an entire monograph to the intriguing epicleses, invocations of the Spirit, in the Acts of Thomas.[7]

Still, compared to the rites of initiation and the Eucharistic meals – which most of the time appear in an initiatory context for that matter – other liturgical and ritual elements have received relatively little attention until now. With the exception of the invocations of the Spirit mentioned before, this holds true in particular for the songs and prayers that have been inserted in the stories dealing with the missionary activities, miracles and martyrdoms of the apostles of which the various Acts are composed. One of the rare scholarly publications that has been devoted to these texts

---

[1] KLIJN 1962 (second revised edition, 2003).
[2] WINKLER 1978; ead. 1982, esp. 132–146.
[3] WINKLER 1996.
[4] MESSNER 2000.
[5] MCGOWAN 1999, esp. 191–194.
[6] ROUWHORST 1990; id. 2008; id. 2010; id. 2011.
[7] MYERS 2010. Cf. for these epicleses also JOHNSON 1999.

is a recent article by H. HOUGHTON which has appeared in the periodical *Apocrypha*.[8]

Of the various Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, those of Thomas are doubtless the ones which are most relevant to our volume. To begin, they are very rich in texts, especially prayer texts, which appear to reflect directly or indirectly existing liturgical traditions. What is perhaps even more interesting, is the fact that the origins of the Acts of Thomas are unanimously situated in Northern Mesopotamia, either in Edessa or in Nisibis, which was a borderland in linguistic and cultural respects.[9] The majority of the people living in these regions spoke Syriac, an Aramaic language, but many of them had some knowledge of the Greek language or were bilingual.[10] The history of the transmission of the Acts of Thomas gives clear evidence of this fact: It is very difficult to establish the precise relationship of the two oldest versions of the Acts which have been preserved, namely the Greek and the Syriac ones. It is quite generally agreed that the Greek text, transmitted by several manuscripts, is the one that is closest to the original that has been lost.[11] The Syriac version has obviously been corrected in the sense of having been made to conform more to 'orthodox tradition'. Still, most scholars believe that the Acts were originally composed in Syriac, but were translated into Greek at a very early date. This in itself already strongly suggests that the Acts originated in a bilingual region. It implies, moreover, that the authors (or redactors) were familiar with Greek hymn and prayer genres, which were in use among both pagans and Christians, but also with Aramaic and Syriac categories of liturgical poetry which were produced in cities like Nisibis and Edessa. These later categories, in particular, the *madrashe* and *sogyotho*, are often designated as 'hymns'. Finally, it may be noted that large Jewish communities were living in this region and they had their own particular prayer traditions which may have influenced Christian ways of praying.

Given the bilingual, multicultural and multi-religious region in which the Acts of Thomas originated, it will be fascinating to study more in detail the songs and prayers which are part of this source. What are the most

---

[8] HOUGHTON 2004.

[9] Cf. for a brief overview of the theories that have been developed with regard to the provenance of the Acts: MYERS 2010, 34–44.

[10] Cf. MILLAR 1998. Cf. for the earliest history of Syriac Christianity: MURRAY 2004 (second revised edition), 1–38; VAN ROMPAY 2008.

[11] Cf. MYERS 2010, 17–19. Cf. also BREMMER 2001, 74–90.

striking characteristics of these texts? Which traditions, Greek, Syriac or otherwise, do they reflect? Finally, given the central theme of this volume, it should also be asked to what extent these texts might be called 'hymns', or at least what elements they have in common with texts that are usually designated as such?

1. Greek Hymns and Syriac Teaching-Songs.

To answer the last-mentioned question, it will be necessary first to clarify what we mean by the term 'hymn'. Here we encounter a twofold difficulty. First, there is the question of providing an exact definition of the Greek word 'hymnos' from which the term 'hymn' is derived. Second, it is quite common to designate various Syriac and Aramaic liturgical texts, such as *madrashe* and *sogyotho*, as 'hymns', but this usage is rather confusing and even misleading since these texts differ from the Greek hymns in several respects. Therefore, some terminological observations are in order.

Although the precise definition of what a Greek hymn is continues to be a matter of discussion, on the basis of the numerous examples that have been preserved, one may note at least the following characteristics:[12]

(1) Hymns are addressed to a god or gods. Even if their primary purpose may be to convey instruction *about gods* and to narrate stories about them to an audience, they are forms of worship. That is, they are sung to the gods in order to celebrate their great and glorious deeds and to win their goodwill and secure his or her favour or help.[13]

(2) As a rule hymns follow typical tripartite structure which comprises the following parts:

(a) an invocation of the deity who is called by his name (or names). This part can be quite elaborate, including alternative names, descriptive predicates, epithets and so on. An elaborate invocation may fulfil several functions: it may help prevent confusing different gods (in a polytheistic religion, this may be a serious danger); it may also serve to please the god invoked; and finally it may contribute to the performative, magical effect of the hymn, so to speak.

(b) a narrative section (*pars epica*) which explains the reason for the prayer. It may give justification for why the deity is called upon or remind the deity invoked of previous occasions on which he has given aid. At the

---

[12] Cf. for the following FURLEY/BREMER 2001, 1–64, esp. 50–63.
[13] Id., 1–8.

same time, this narrative part may also fulfil a didactic function and be directed at transmitting information about the gods to the audience. The length of this part may vary considerably. It can be very brief, but it may also take up nearly the entire piece.

(c) a request in which a favour is sought from the deity.

(3) Nearly all hymns are written in a fixed meter that is based upon the principle of the length of the vowels (as is usual in classical Greek poetry). They often also make use of other literary devices that are characteristic of poetry, such as the division in strophes.

(4) Hymns are meant to be sung in a ritual setting by a soloist or a choir to a specific melody. Mostly they are accompanied by musical instruments. The rhythm and the character of the language are suited to ritual performance.

It should be noted that the difference between hymns and other religious texts – in particular prayers – is not always very clear.[14] On the one hand, as a rule prayers lack features which are typical of poetry and also play a prominent role in hymns, such as fixed meters, subdivisions in strophes. Furthermore, the language of prayer is usually closer to that of normal speech. On the other hand, the tripartite structure which is found in most of the hymns, also appears in many prayers, at least in stylized prayers that were said during religious ceremonies or at official occasions. More specifically, what prayers and hymns have in common is that they contain both elements of praise and petitions. For that matter, the genres of hymns and prayers will have influenced each other.

Further, it is important to note that Greek hymns differed in several respects from Aramaic forms of liturgical poetry that were used by Jews, Samaritans and Syriac Christians alike, and of which the *madrashe* and *sogyotho* were just Syriac Christian varieties. Aramaic liturgical poetry, and this also pertains to the Syriac Christian forms, have a number of elements in common with Greek hymns. They are performed in liturgical settings and have religious content. Moreover, they are meant to be sung by soloists and choirs and are forms of poetry. Yet, one may note two crucial differences between the two types of liturgical poetry.[15]

(a) Aramaic, especially Syriac poetry, is based on other poetic principles than Greek hymns. Aramaic and Syriac poetry is syllabic, which

---

[14] Cf. for the characteristics and structures of Greek prayers: PULLEYN 1997, esp. 39–69; ALDERINK/MARTIN 1997, 123–127.

[15] Cf. for Syriac liturgical poetry, BROCK 2008, 657–671. Cf. for the wider field of Aramaic poetry (in the first centuries CE): RODRIGUES PEREIRA 1997.

means that not the length, but the number of syllables matters, each stanza consisting of a certain number of verses that comprise a fixed number of syllables.

(b) Even more importantly, most Aramaic and Syriac poetic liturgical texts exhibit a number of features which are directly related to their Jewish or Christian background, more specifically to the central role of the Bible in Judaism and Christianity. One of the most striking characteristics of these texts is the great prominence given to the narrative element, which fulfils a primarily kerygmatic or didactic function. Many of these texts may be characterized as sung forms of preaching or biblical meditation. Very often God is only addressed at the beginning of the text and at the end in a concluding doxology and in the refrains that are repeated after each strophe. The major part of the text usually consists of meditations about, or explanations of, biblical stories or themes or – in the case of some Christian texts – of anti-heretical polemics. It can be no coincidence that the best known type of Aramaic liturgical poetry – which was very popular in Syriac Christianity – is called *madrasha,* a word which is derived from the same root as the Jewish 'midrash' (teach) and in Syriac has the connotation of 'teaching', 'dispute'. Instead of 'hymns', one should therefore rather characterize them as 'teaching songs' or 'preaching songs'.

2. Greek, Jewish, and Christian Prayers.

The differences between Greek hymns and Syriac forms of liturgical poetry having been pointed out and clarified, it will now be convenient to make some brief remarks about the forms of prayer that were practiced by (pagan) Greeks, Jews, and Christians.

While talking about the elements hymns and prayers have in common, I have mentioned the importance of the tripartite structure as a major characteristic of both categories of religious texts. However, the role played by this tripartite structure should not be overstated. It was but a format that could be filled by communities or individuals in various ways. Moreover, the role played by the three elements could vary considerably. The major part of some prayers may primarily or even exclusively have consisted of lengthy invocations of the god and a litany-like enumeration of his names and attributes. In other prayers, a request or praise addressed to a god may have been the predominant element.

Not surprisingly, both Jews and Christians have developed their own forms of prayers (even if they often made use of the tripartite structure). Thus, a typical characteristic of many Jewish prayers – especially those deriving from rabbinic milieus as well as many texts preserved in the Dead

Sea Scrolls – is that they are interspersed with blessings and thanksgivings. Furthermore, the emphasis that is being laid in both Jewish and Christian prayers upon the remembrance of Biblical events, may lead to a sometimes very extensive elaboration of the narrative middle section. Finally, since belief in Jesus Christ is the most crucial issue for Christians, creed-like passages may appear in Christian prayers texts. We will find examples of all these varieties in the Act of Thomas.

3. The composition of the Acts of Thomas

Although both the Greek and the Syriac versions of the Acts of Thomas read like an ongoing story starting with Judas Thomas being sent by Jesus to India and ending with the apostle's martyrdom, it is clear that the text underlying both versions betrays the hand(s) of one or even more editors who have combined various sources and have made use of rather heterogeneous materials. There is no need to extensively deal here with this issue, but some observations will be indispensable for a correct understanding of the songs and prayers we shall examine in this paper.

First, it has been noted by Paul-Hubert POIRIER and Yves TISSOT, who have published a French translation of the Acts in the famous Pleiade series[16] – and in addition by Susan MYERS[17] – that the Acts consists of two parts, namely ch. 1–81 and ch. 82 till the end. The first half contains a number of tales which form more or less independent units. In this part, there are no traces of a radical, encratite rejection of marriage. The second half constitutes a coherent story which is situated in the court of King Mazdai and is moreover characterized by a downright and pronounced encratism. One of the most central themes of the story is the conversion of women by Thomas who, as a direct consequence of their conversion, they refuse to have sexual intercourse with their legal husbands. Thus all the conversion stories end with exhortations to sexual renunciation, which is considered as a prerequisite for becoming a Christian. It may be that the author of the second half was also the redactor of the entire work, that is, of the version that lay at the basis of the Greek and the Syriac versions.

What is of even greater importance for the subject of this contribution is that in both halves of the Acts we find various texts, in particular prayers, speeches and hymns, which make the impression of being more or less

---

[16] POIRIER/TISSOT 1997, 1321–1470, here 1323–1325.
[17] MYERS 2010, 30–34. Cf. also ead.: 2006, 95–112.

independent units. Most likely they were reworked by the redactors so as to better fit into the narrative and to be more in line with their own theological ideas, but they were not composed by themselves. Obviously, this has implications for the study and the interpretation of these texts. These pieces do not just reflect the views of the author(s) or redactor(s), but must have their origins in certain liturgical practices. Moreover, this may also place the question of the original language in a new light. Even if the authors or editors wrote their (more or less final) versions in Syriac, one cannot rule out the possibility that they inserted pieces derived from a Greek-speaking milieu.[18] In a bilingual milieu, this would be hardly surprising.

4. Two Syriac "hymns"

The Syriac and the Greek versions of the Acts contain only two pieces which can be qualified as hymns. The Syriac versions of both poems are in syllabic verse – in a six-syllable meter – which indicates that they were originally composed in Syriac.[19]

The first of these texts is called an ᾠδή (Syr. *zmirta*) and is found in chapters 6–7.[20] It can be characterized as a marriage song which is sung by the apostle at the end of a meal (from which he did not taste anything). The song is about a female figure who is called the "daughter of light" and is described as a bride who stays in a splendid and luminous bride-chamber. In the Greek version, which here again appears to be closer to the original than to the Syriac, her identity remains somewhat enigmatic. Several features are reminiscent of Jewish wisdom, but she may also be considered a personification of the soul at the point of marrying a heavenly bridegroom (for the rest, both interpretations do not exclude each other.) In the Syriac version which clearly is the result of an "orthodox" revision, the female figure is identified with the Church. For the rest, we have to reckon with the possibility that the song was inserted in the narrative at a later stage. It forms an independent unity that does not really interrupt the flow of the narrative, but it can be omitted without implications for the

---

[18] Thus rightly POIRIER/TISSOT 1997, 1324.

[19] Cf. for this text KLIJN 1962 (well-documented and detailed commentary), 168–179; MURRAY 2004, 133–135; BROCK 2008, 660.

[20] Greek text: LIPSIUS/BONNET 1903, 109–110. Syriac text: WRIGHT 1871, vol. I, 176–177.

comprehensibility of the story. This is corroborated by the Arabic version and the Latin Passion of Thomas, in which the piece is lacking.[21] It must have been incorporated into the narrative at a quite early period, as it is part of the available manuscripts of both the Greek and the Syriac versions.

The second "hymn" is the famous and much discussed "hymn of the Pearl" (ch. 108–113), dealing with a prince from the East who is sent to find a pearl in a foreign country (Egypt). The place of this text (which in Syriac is called a 'madrasha' and a 'psalmos' in Greek) within the Acts of Thomas is in many respects comparable to that of the marriage song of ch. 6–7. Both texts have in common that they are interpolations. That the Hymn of the Pearl has been inserted into the narrative clearly results from the fact that it is lacking in the great majority of the Greek and the Syriac manuscripts (occurring in only one Greek and in one Syriac manuscript), and POIRIER, the author of a monograph about the Hymn of the Pearl, has pointed out that most likely the original (or the oldest versions of the Acts of Thomas) did not contain a hymn or a hymn-like piece at all in this section of the Acts.[22]

5. Prayers and Epicleses

This means that hymns, whether understood as Greek cult-songs or as Aramaic/Syriac teaching songs, did not figure in the core narrative underlying the Greek and the Syriac versions of the Acts of Thomas or, if the marriage song was part of it, it played a very minor role in it. The question arises whether this is all there is to be said about hymns in the Acts of Thomas. I would argue that this would be too hasty a conclusion. Even if pieces that might be characterized as hymns are completely or mostly lacking in the Acts, all the versions of this source contain a series of prayers which are strongly reminiscent of texts that are commonly considered hymns or at least contain stylistic elements that are typical of them. Tellingly, in the French translation of the Acts, which has appeared in the Pléiade series, some of the prayers of the apostle are designated in the headings inserted by the translators as "hymnes".[23] The translators must have felt that this was the title which was best suited to these pieces.

[21] Edition and French translation of the Arabic version: VAN ESBROECK 1987. Edition of the Latin version: ZELZER 1977.

[22] POIRIER 1981, 171–184. Cf. also id. 1976.

[23] Cf. POIRIER/TISSOT 1997, 1393 (ch. 72); 1450–1451 (ch. 142–143).

Therefore, it will be interesting to have a closer look at some of these texts.

A Prayer for the Daughter of King Gundaphoros

In the same part of the Acts, in which Thomas sings his marriage-song (or into which this text has been inserted), King Gundaphoros asks him to pray for his daughter who is on the point of marrying her husband-to-be. Thomas responds to this request by saying the following prayer (I give here the Greek and the Syriac versions in parallel columns.)

Syriac version	Greek version
My lord *and my God*, companion of his servants, guide and conductor of those who believe in him,	Our lord, companion of his servants, guide and conductor of those who believe in him,
refuge and rest of the afflicted,	refuge and rest of the afflicted,
hope of the poor and redeemer of the captives,	hope of the poor and redeemer of the captives,
healer of souls lying in sickness	healer of sick souls
and saviour of all creation,	life-giver (saviour) of the world
who quickens the world to life,	and saviour of all creatures,
and strengthens the souls,	
you know what is going to happen,	you know what is going to happen
(you) who accomplishes it through us;	and through us you accomplish them;
you, *o lord,*	you are
who reveals hidden mysteries,	the revealer of hidden mysteries,
and makes manifest words that are secret.	and the discloser of secret words.
You, *o lord* are the planter of the good tree,	you are the planter of the good tree,
and by your hands are all good works engendered.	and by your hands all the works were done.
You, *o lord*, are he who is in all and passes through all	
and dwells in all your works,	You are hidden in all your works,
and are manifested in the working of them all.	and are manifested in their acts.
Jesus Christ, son of compassion and perfect saviour,	Jesus, perfect son of perfect mercy;
Christ, son of the living God,	*and you became the Messiah,* *and put on the first man.*
the undaunted power which overthrew the enemy,	You are the power, *and the knowledge, and the will,*
the voice that was heard by the archons,	*and the rest of your father in whom you*

which shook all their powers;	*are concealed in glory,* *and in whom you are revealed in your creative agency;* *and dwell in all your works,* and manifest in the working of them all. *And you are one with two names.* *And you manifested yourself as a feeble (being),* *and those who saw you, thought of you, that you were a man who had need of help.* *And you showed the glory of your godhead in your longsuffering towards our manhood,* *when you hurled the evil (one) from his power,* *and called with your voice to the dead* *and those who were alive and hoping in you,* *you promised an inheritance in your kingdom.*
ambassador from the height	You were the ambassador, and were sent from the supernal heights, *because you are able to do the living and perfect will of him who sent you.* *Glorious are you, lord, in your might;* *and your renovating administration is in all your creatures,* *and in all the works which your godhead has established;* *and no other is able to annul the will of your majesty,* *nor to stand up against your nature as you are*
who even descended to Hades who, having opened the doors, brought thence those who *for many ages* had been shut up in the *treasury of darkness*, and you showed them the way that leads up to the height;	and you descended to Sheol, and went to the uttermost end, and opened its gates, and brought out its prisoners, and you trod for them the path (leading) above *by the nature of your godhead.*
I pray to you, Jesus,	Yea, lord, I ask of you,

as I bring to you my supplication for *these young people,* that you do for them the things that help and are useful and profitable.	that whatever thou know to be beneficial for them, you will do for them.

There are considerable differences between the Greek and the Syriac version. It is obvious that the Syriac text has been adapted to a more orthodox type of Christianity. This is most clearly the case in the middle part of the prayer, in which Jesus Christ is invoked and in which his descent to the earth and Hades/Sheol is commemorated. The Syriac text is much longer and a clearer and sharper distinction is made between the incarnation and the descent into Sheol than is the case in the Greek text.[24] One gets the idea that in the Greek text there is no basic difference between Hades and the place where human beings live prior to their death, which of course betrays a basically dualist worldview. Apart from these differences, however, both of the texts have the same literary structure, and the same framework which is already present in the Greek version and which is elaborated in the Syriac one:

– The first part of the prayer consists of a long invocation addressed to the Lord who turns out to be Jesus. (His Name is used in the vocative.) The Lord, Jesus, is predicated by a number of (divine) epithets or titles. Sometimes a substantive is used, sometimes a verbal form. In the latter case, both in Greek and Syriac we find the present participle (which in the Greek version is preceded by an article).

– In the second part, Jesus is explicitly addressed in the second person singular, which is again followed by a number of divine epithets which focus upon God's knowledge of what will happen in the future and his role as origin and creator of the universe. Here as well, one may note a strong preference for the use of the present participle.

– The third part opens with the mentioning of the name of Jesus Christ, which again, just as in the preceding parts, is followed by a litany-like series of epithets. From now on, however, the present participle is replaced with an aorist participle in Greek and the perfect tense in Syriac. From the point of view of the content, it may be observed that all the statements and enunciations relate to Christ's salvific descent to the earth and to Hades.

---

[24] Cf. KLIJN 1962, 190–191.

– The fourth and final part consists of an extremely brief petition or request in which God is asked to give the fiancés what is beneficial to them. For the king this means a happy and successful marriage, but the apostle understands by these words something entirely different, namely sexual renunciation.

Obviously, from the point of view of its contents, the common core underlying both versions is thoroughly Christian. However, its formal structure fully corresponds to that of a traditional Greek or Hellenistic prayer and, moreover, to that of a Greek hymn! We find the three major elements which are typical of most of those prayers: (a) an invocation of the deity who is called by his name(s) (part 1 and 2); (b) a narrative section or *pars epica* (part 2); (c) a request in which a favour is sought from the deity.

The Baptismal Epiclesis of Chapter 27

Apart from this type of prayer (of which one may find other examples in the Acts of Thomas), one also encounters striking similarities with (certain types of) Greek hymns in the baptismal and eucharistic epicleses which appear in ch. 27 and 50 and have been thoroughly studied in recent scholarship.[25] I will take as an example the epiclesis of ch. 27 which the apostle pronounces while pouring oil over the heads of King Gundaphoros (as part of the ritual initiation). I will first give the Greek and the Syriac texts in parallel columns:

Greek version	Syriac version
And the apostle took the oil and pouring it on their heads anointed and chrismed them, and began to say:	And Judas went up and stood upon the edge of the cistern, and poured oil upon their heads, and said:
‘Come (ἐλθέ), holy name of Christ that is above every name;	‘Come (*thā*), holy name of Christ;
come, power of the Most High and perfect compassion;	come, power of grace, which art from on high.
	Come, perfect compassion.
come, thou highest gift;	come, exalted gift;
come, compassionate mother;	come sharer of the blessing;
come, fellowship of the male;	
come, thou (fem.) that does reveal the	come, revealer of the hidden mysteries;

[25] Cf. footnote 7.

hidden mysteries;	
come, mother of the seven houses, that thy rest may be in the eighth house;	come, mother of the seven houses whose rest was in the eighth house;
come, elder of the five members, understanding, thought, prudence, consideration, reasoning.	*come, messenger of reconciliation*
Communicate with these young men!	and communicate with the minds of these youths!
Come, Holy Spirit, and purify their reins and their heart	Come, Holy Spirit, and purify their reins and their hearts.’
and give them the added sealing in the name of the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit’.	*And he baptized them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Spirit of holiness.*

One may note some differences between the two versions, but both texts basically consist of a series of invocations that are addressed to the name of Christ which is represented as a female person. Each invocation begins by calling her by a different name or title and then asks her to “come” (Greek: ἐλθέ, and Syriac: *thā*). A lot could be said about the divine figure who is invoked (who in other epicleses in the Acts proves to be identical with the Holy Spirit and is reminiscent of Jewish Wisdom) and also about the titles which have many parallels in various Christian traditions, both orthodox and heterodox ones.[26] For our purpose, the most relevant thing is that the request to “come” addressed to a god or goddess whose titles are enumerated – often with the imperative ἐλθέ or a synonym being repeated – also appears in various Greek sources.[27] Already Lietzmann had drawn attention to the existence of repeated invocations of Hermes, beginning with the same imperative, which figured in Greek magical papyri.[28] Even more interestingly with regard to the topic of this paper, this phenomenon also appears in some Greek texts that may be best characterized as “hymns”. One may mention more in particular an ode composed by

[26] Cf. especially Klijn 1962, 211–217; 245–246; Johnson 2004, 191–204; Myers 2010, 185–218.

[27] Cf. Myers 2010, 167–177.

[28] Lietzmann 1926. The texts had been edited by Preisendanz 1974, 45–50 (no. VIII). Cf. also Betz 1992; Johnson 2004, 187–188; Myers 2010, 176.

Sappho for Aphrodite,[29] and moreover several of the Orphic hymns, texts which are roughly contemporaneous with the Acts of Thomas.[30]

A Prayer in Praise of Jesus

Besides echoes of Greek hymns, one may discern in the prayer texts of the Acts of Thomas traces of other forms of liturgical poetry which have a number of elements in common with them, but which appear to have been influenced by different biblical traditions. I will give as an example a prayer which is said by the apostle in chapter 80, when on the point of driving a demon out of the wife and the daughter of an Indian general. Here follows the English translation of the Greek version. I will leave aside the Syriac one since the differences between both versions are not relevant for our focus of interest.

> What I am to think about your beauty, Jesus, and what I am to tell about you, I do not know. Or rather, I am not able.
> For I have no power to declare it, O Christ,
> who are at rest and only wise,
> who alone know what is in the heart, and understand the content of the thought.
> To you be glory, o merciful and tranquil one.
> To you glory, o wise word!
> Glory to your compassion that was poured out upon us!
> Glory to your pity that was spread out over us!
> Glory to your greatness which for our sake became small.
> Glory to your highest kingship which for our sake was humbled.
> Glory to your strength which for our sakes was made weak.
> Glory to your godhead which for our sake was seen in the likeness of men.
> Glory to your manhood which for our sake died that it might make us live.
> Glory to your resurrection from the dead,
> for through it rising and rest come to our souls.
> Glory and honour to your ascent into the heavens,
> for through it you have shown us the ascent to the height,
> having promised us that we shall sit on your right hand
> and with you judge the twelve tribes of Israel.
> You are the heavenly Word of the Father.
> You are the hidden light of the understanding,
> he who shows the way of truth,
> pursuer of the darkness and obliterator of error.

[29] Edition of the Greek text: PAGE 1968, 98–99.
[30] Edition of the Greek text: QUANDT 1962. English translation: ATHANASSAKIS 1997. Cf. MYERS 2010, 170ff.

This prayer contains many elements which are reminiscent of hymns. Apart from the fact that Jesus is addressed and is honoured by a number of divine titles, one may mention its highly stylized character, in particular its rhythm which would make it suited to be sung or recited rather than simply being said. Still, it contains some characteristics which do not appear in Greek hymns (or prayers for that matter). The most remarkable thing is that it basically consists of a chain of praises beginning with the word "glory" (Greek: δόξα, Syriac: *šubha*). A request is lacking. If one looks for parallels, one may find some in early Syriac texts, such as the Odes of Solomon, which have been composed in a more free style than the *madrashe* and other classical Syriac genres. At least, here as well, the element of praise plays a very prominent role. However, it is also clear that many biblical echoes resound here. The similarities with some of the biblical psalms, especially those which contain series of phrases in which God is glorified, praised or thanked (see for instance Ps 134–136; 146–150), are very striking. One may perhaps also hear the echo of the angels singing glory to God in Bethlehem. Otherweise, the predilection early Christians had for "doxologies" is well-known.

The Role Played by Repetition and Redundancy

It has become clear by now that varying traditions and various types of hymns have left their imprint upon the prayers of the Acts of Thomas. One can hear the echoes of both biblical Psalms and similar texts, especially Syriac Christian texts, as well as from various categories of (pagan) Greek hymns. However, there is one stylistic feature which all texts have in common, whatever their hymnological antecedents may have been, namely their remarkable predilection for repetition and redundancy. As a matter of fact, this element is already to be found in most of the hymnological traditions which the prayers of the Acts influenced and the author or redactor of the Acts may have borrowed it from those. Yet, in many cases one gets the idea that they play a much more prominent role than in the Greek and biblical hymnological genres underlying these prayers. The predilection for repetition manifests itself in various ways: in the extensive and litany-like enumeration of titles of Christ (in the first parts of the prayers, in the invocations); in the chains of short sentences and clauses having a participle or second person perfect as their (main) verb; and finally in the multiplication of imperatives derived from the verb '*elthein*' (ἔλθειν).

It should be noted that this remarkable love for redundancy and repetition is not an isolated phenomenon in Syriac Christianity. In his classical study of early Syriac literature and culture *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, Robert MURRAY points to the fact that early Syriac literature is

particularly rich in symbolic titles of Christ and shows a tendency to multiply them in litany-like passages.[31] Apart from the passages of the Acts of Thomas we have examined, he gives as examples Aphrahat's fourteenth Demonstration, several *madrashe* by Ephrem (drawn from various collections) on Nativity and passages from the Coptic Manichaean Psalms and from the Pseudo-Macarian Homilies (The last two works mentioned were not composed in Syriac, but were derived from cultural milieus that were closely related to Syriac-speaking Christianity.) MURRAY, moreover, pointed to the similarities these texts show with ancient Sumerian sources, in particular with the Seven Epithets of Enlil, and suggests there might be some sort of continuity of feeling between some ancient Sumerian litanies and the Syriac litany-like texts, such as those found in the Acts of Thomas.[32] Although difficult to substantiate, this is nonetheless a very intriguing hypothesis.

Illuminating and intriguing though MURRAY'S observations may be, they can explain the prominence of this phenomenon in Syriac literature – and in particular in the Acts of Thomas – only to a certain point, namely as they may be helpful in retracing its literary and historical antecedents and roots. This approach should be complemented by one which rather asks which function the multiplication of titles and the love of repetition and parallels may have served in the Acts of Thomas and in the liturgical traditions which these sources reflect. In fact, we may learn from anthropological studies on rituals that in ritual settings redundancy and repetition contribute to and have the effect of enhancing the performative or, if one will, the magic force of texts. It should be realized that ritual texts do not just serve to transmit information about religious topics. In combination with other non-verbal elements, such as intonation, recitation, singing and music (characteristics which play a prominent role in hymns and hymn-like texts) they help to produce a sense of heightened and intensified communication between human beings and the divine realm as well as among the human beings who are participating.[33]

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the apostle Thomas is regularly called by his pagan opponents and enemies a "magician", a "sorcerer".[34] One might argue that this primarily relates to the numerous

---

[31] MURRAY 2004, 159–171.

[32] Id., 160.

[33] Cf. in particular TAMBIAH 1979, 113–169.

[34] Ch. 20; 21; 95–106; 114–116; 123; 127; 130; 134; 138; 139; 152; 162–163. The importance of this fact has already been noted by JOHNSON 1999, 186.

miracles described in the Acts of Thomas. This may be the case, but it should not be overlooked that the prayers said by Thomas are closely related to his miraculous and magical activities. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that these prayers contain a number of literary features which are suited to enhancing their performative power.

What is finally of particular relevance with regard to the central theme of this collection of papers is that the most typical features of the prayers of the apostle appear to have their roots in various hymnological traditions. If this is correct, we may conclude that, after all, hymns played an important role in the Acts of Thomas, albeit in an indirect way.

Bibliography

ALDERINK, L./MARTIN, L.: Prayer in Greco-Roman Religions. In: Prayer from Alexander to Constantine, ed. M. KILEY et al., London 1997, 123–127.

ATHANASSAKIS, N.: The Orphic Hymns, Missoula 1997.

BETZ, H. D.: The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, including the Demotic Spells, Chicago [2]1992.

BREMMER, J.: The Acts of Thomas: Place, Date and Women. In: id.: The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas, Leuven 2001, 74–90.

BROCK, S.: Poetry and Hymnography (3): Syriac. In: The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies, ed. S. A. HARVEY et al., Oxford 2008, 657–671.

FURLEY, W./BREMER, J.: Greek Hymns. Volume I: The Texts in Translation (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 9), Tübingen 2001.

HOUGHTON, A.: The Discourse of Prayer in the Major Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. In: Apocrypha 15 (2004), 171–200.

JOHNSON, C.: Ritual Epicleses in the Greek Acts of Thomas. In: The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles (Harvard Divinity School Studies), ed. F. BOVON et al., Cambridge Mass. 1999, 171–204.

KLIJN, A.: The Acts of Thomas. Introduction – Text – Commentary, Leiden 1962 (second revised edition, 2003).

LIETZMANN, H.: Messe und Herrenmahl, Berlin 1926.

LIPSIUS, R./BONNET, M.: Acta apostolorum apocrypha 2,2, Leipzig 1903.

MCGOWAN, A.: Ascetic Eucharistis. Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals, Oxford 1999.

MESSNER, R.: Zur Eucharistie in den Thomasakten. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der eucharistischen Epiklese. In: Crossroad of Cultures. Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler (OCA 260), ed. H.-J. FEULNER et al., Rome 2000, 493–513.

MILLAR, F.: Ethnic Identity in the Roman Near East 325–450. Language, Religion and Culture, in: Mediterranean Archaeology 11 (1998), 159–176.

MURRAY, R.: Symbols of Church and Kingdom. A Study in Early Syriac Tradition, Piscataway [2]2004.

MYERS, S.: Spirit Epicleses in the Acts of Thomas (WUNT II 281), Tübingen 2010.

– Revisiting Preliminary Issues in the Acts of Thomas. In: Apocrypha 17 (2006), 95–112.

PAGE, D.: Lyrica Graeca selecta, Oxford 1968.

POIRIER, P. H./TISSOT, Y.: Actes de Thomas. In: Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade 442), ed. F. BOVON, Paris 1997, 1321–1470.
– L'hymne de la Perle des Actes de Thomas, Louvain-la-Neuve 1981.
– L'hymne de la Perle des Actes de Thomas. Étude de la tradition manuscrite. In: Symposium syriacum 1976 célebré du 13 au 17 septembre 1976 au Centre Culturel "Les Fontaines" de Chantilly (OCA 205), Rome 1978, 19–29.
PULLEYN, S.: Prayer in Greek Religion, Oxford 1997.
QUANDT, W.: Orphei Hymni, Berlin 1955.
RODRIGUES PEREIRA, A. S.: Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.–c. 600 C.E.). Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems (SSN 34), Assen 1997.
ROUWHORST, G.: Faire mémoire par un geste: La fraction du pain. In: Faire mémoire. L'anamnèse dans la liturgie, Conférences Saint-Serge LVIe Semaine d'Études liturgiques. Paris, 29 juin–2 juillet, 2009, ed. A. LOSSKY and M. SODI, Città del Vaticano 2011, 75–86.
– L'usage et le non-usage du vin. In: Rites de communion. Conférences Saint-Serge LVe Semaine d'Études liturgiques. Paris, 23–26 juin 2008, ed. A. LOSSKY and M. SODI, Città del Vaticano 2010, 229–241.
– Die Rolle des heiligen Geistes in der Eucharistie und der Taufe im frühsyrischen Christentum. In: Liturgie und Trinität (QD 229), ed. B. GROEN and B. KRANEMANN, Freiburg im Breisgau 2008, 161–184.
– La célébration de l'eucharistie selon les Actes de Thomas. In: Omnes circumadstantes. Contributions Towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy, ed. C. CASPERS and M. SCHNEIDERS, Kampen 1990, 51–77.
TAMBIAH, S.: A Performative Approach to Ritual. In: PBA 65 (1979), 113–169.
VAN ESBROECK, M.: Les actes apocryphes de Thomas en version arabe. In: ParOr 14 (1987), 11–77.
VAN ROMPAY, L.: The East. Syria and Mesopotamia. In: The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies, ed. S. ASHBROOK HARVEY and D. HUNTER, Oxford 2008, 365–386.
WINKLER, G.: Weitere Beobachtungen zur frühen Epiklese (den Doxologien und dem Sanctus). Über die Bedeutung der Apokryphen für die Entwicklung der Riten. In: OrChr 80 (1996), 177–200.
– Das armenische Initiationsrituale. Entwicklungsgeschichtliche und liturgievergleichende Untersuchung der Quellen des 3. bis 10. Jahrhunderts (OCA 217), Rome 1982.
– The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications. A Study of the Armenian, Syriac and Greek Terminology of the Oil. In: Worship 52 (1978), 24–45.
WRIGHT, W.: Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, London 1871 (reprint: Amsterdam 1968).
ZELZER, K.: Die alten lateinischen Thomasakten, Berlin 1977.

Index of Modern Authors

Page numbers in Italics: full bibliography

Index of Subjects and Sources